

**A CASE STUDY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MODERN FAMILY:
URBAN SCOTLAND IN THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY**

LYNN JAMIESON

Ph.D.

University of Edinburgh

1983



DECLARATION

This thesis has been composed by myself and the research on which it is based was my own work.

ABSTRACT

This thesis is based upon interviews with 87 working-class and middle-class men and women born between 1896 and 1910 and brought up in urban Scotland. In these interviews I took respondents through their childhood and youth, and focused in particular on their relationship with their parents. These oral histories of growing up in early 20th century Scotland are used to evaluate accounts of the development of 'the modern family' in the work of Parsons, Goode, Zaretsky, Stone, Shorter, Aries, Lasch and Donzelot. It is argued that these authors agree on four distinctive features of 'the modern family' - 'child-centredness', 'separation-off', an emphasis on the individual and exaggerated sex-role segregation - and, in general, agree that these are to be found first of all in the middle class. Individual authors differ, however, on the particular sequences of the emergence of these features. In four successive chapters I examine the extent to which my respondents' families exhibited these features, and whether the families of working-class and middle-class respondents differed. The conclusions reached in these chapters are used to establish whether 'the modern family', as the above authors understand it, existed in early 20th century Scotland, and I conclude that it largely did not. The particular pattern of presence and absence of features I found was more damaging to some authors' accounts than others.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the following organisations and individuals for helping me find my respondents: Abbeyfield Housing Association, Craigmillar Festival Society, Dr Cruikshank, Morningside Rd, Dalry House, Eastern Co-op Women's Guild, Edinburgh District Housing Department, Dr Gray, Lauder Rd., Glenorchy Nursing Home, Dr Illingworth and staff of Bruntsfield Health Centre, Lamb's House, Ian and Barbara Ritchie, Varrich House. I would prefer to have named all the individuals who helped me, for example the wardens of sheltered housing and day care centres, and officials in the Housing Department and housing associations. Unfortunately I did not faithfully record their names and am unable to do so.

All the people I have lived with over the years of this work have given me tremendous support and I wish to thank them all, and especially Stuart Anderson who helped me survive my various false starts and bad moods. To all at 100 Findhorn Place heartfelt thanks for tolerating my absence and pitiful contribution to domestic labour.

There are a number of people who have given me assistance with the writing stage. Thanks to Terri Ainslie, Stuart Anderson and Anne Stafford for work on the word processor, to Andrew (Basz) Lyon for chasing references and to Caroline Bamford for proof reading. Particularly long hours of proof reading were put in by Fraser Goodall, while Jane Hesketh did the bulk of the corrections on the word processor. Horrible jobs done

ungrudgingly and I am very grateful. Donald MacKenzie did substantial editorial work on the entire text and I would never have made the final deadline without his assistance.

My supervisors Mike Anderson and Tom McGlew have given me considerable assistance throughout not just with the thesis itself but with my academic life more generally. At key times they have given me invaluable support.

In the last three years I had the pleasure of working with Judy Wajcman, from whom I learnt a lot.

Finally, I want to thank the people I interviewed. In this work their anonymity is preserved. All the names are fictitious as I promised. By giving generously of their time these people made this work possible. Using their stories for theoretical purposes inevitably does violence to the wholeness of their lives, but nevertheless I hope something of the richness of what they told me shows through.

Table of Contents

Chapter One	Introductory Remarks	1
Chapter Two	Accounts of the Development of 'the Modern Family'	10
	<u>Parsons and Goode</u>	11
	Parsons	11
	Goode	17
	<u>Zaretsky</u>	19
	<u>Lasch, Donzelot</u>	23
	<u>Aries, Shorter, Stone</u>	30
	Aries	32
	Stone	35
	<u>Similarities between Authors</u>	38
	Notes	43
Chapter Three	Abstract Accounts and Historical Actuality	49
	<u>Theory, Data and Test Cases</u>	49
	<u>Growing up in Scotland and 'the Modern Family'</u>	55
	<u>Making use of the Similarities and Differences in Accounts</u>	60
	Notes	70
Chapter Four	Scottish Society, Structural Change and the Family	71
	<u>Introduction</u>	71
	<u>Industrialisation</u>	73
	The Unevenness of Industrialisation	75
	Industrialisation and Class Structure	77
	<u>Urbanisation</u>	82
	<u>Demographic Transition</u>	83
	<u>Affluence</u>	85
	<u>The early Inter-War Years</u>	88
	<u>The Separation of Family and 'Work'</u>	92
	The Middle-Class Woman and the Ideal of the 'Perfect Lady'	101
	<u>The Development of State Intervention</u>	103
	'Children should be at home or in school'	105
	The problem of working-class adolescents	107
	Intervention in the Name of the Child	109
	Concern with Motherhood	112
	The Impact of State Intervention on the Working Class	114
	<u>Conclusion = the Trees and the Wood</u>	115
	Notes	118
Chapter Five	Child-Centred?	121
	<u>Time and Energy Devoted to Children</u>	133
	Indicators of Time and Energy	133

	Working-class Parents: Time with Children	134
	Spending Time Together	139
	Time on a one-to-one basis	143
	Middle-class Parents: Time with Children	144
	Division of Labour between Mother and Servant	146
	Free-time of Middle-Class Children	150
	Family time and Individual Time	152
	<u>The Nature of Parental Authority</u>	154
	Indicators of Parental Authority	154
	Demands made by Parents: Class and Gender Differences	156
	Deferences	159
	<u>Conclusions</u>	163
	Notes	167
Chapter Six	Experienced as Separated-Off?	172
	<u>The Oasis and the Desert</u>	175
	<u>The Fortified Castle</u>	179
	<u>Neither Oasis nor Fortified Castle</u>	186
	<u>The Container and the Intervening State</u>	187
	Contained or Not?	207
	Notes	212
Chapter Seven	The Balance of Emphasis between the Family and the Individual: the Case of the Young Adult	220
	<u>Working-Class Children: Leaving School and Entering Work</u>	225
	Leaving School Early	225
	Choice of Employment	228
	<u>Middle-class Daughters: Further Education and Entering Work</u>	230
	<u>The Disposable Income and Independence of the Young Person</u>	238
	The Young Working-class Earner at Home	238
	Middle-class Sons and Daughters at Home	247
	<u>Family Obligations of Young People Away from Home</u>	251
	Working-class Sons in the Forces	251
	Working-class Daughters in Service	254
	Middle-class Daughters Away from Home	256
	Going into Digs	256
	Family Obligations	260
	<u>Conclusion</u>	264
	Notes	267
Chapter Eight	Learning to be Housewives and Breadwinners	272

	<u>Experience of doing Housework and Earning while Young</u>	279
	Housework: Working-class Children and Young Earners	280
	Earning: Working-class Children	282
	Housework and Earning: Middle-class Children	283
	<u>Parental Expectations: Demands and Explicit Training</u>	285
	Explicit Training as a 'Housewife'	287
	Expectations and Training as Earners	290
	Respondents' Parents as Role Models	294
	Conclusion	296
	<u>The Abstract Individual and Gender Revisited</u>	296
 Chapter Nine	 Conclusion	 309
	<u>Some Implications of these Findings for the Selected Authors</u>	313
	<u>Parsons, Zaretsky, Aries</u>	316
	Parsons	316
	Zaretsky	319
	Aries	320
	<u>Donzelot</u>	324
	<u>Stone and Goode</u>	327
	<u>Shorter</u>	334
	<u>Lasch</u>	337
	<u>Further Thoughts</u>	340
	Theory and Methods	340
	Issues which are Persistently Problematic to the Accounts	342
	Was there ever a Modern Family?	343
	Notes	347
 Appendix One		 350
 Appendix Two		 353
 References		 364

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

In this thesis I take material detailing aspects of the young lives of people born around 1900. I use it to build a picture of family life in the early 20th century which I can match against a picture of 'the modern family'. I then use the result to comment on the validity of accounts of the development of 'the modern family'.

The reader is probably immediately aware of at least one difficulty. The most obvious question concerns the use of data from one time period to comment on accounts of development. This question is dealt with at length in chapter three. But there are two other types of difficulty which I wish to say something on here. Both concern the nature of the material which is the main source of my data; they are difficulties inherent in the method and difficulties of my own making. Explaining the latter is more difficult and will be taken up in detail at the end of this chapter.

The material I collected consists of what is now referred to as 'oral history'. In my case this means I interviewed people who were born around 1900 and, using an interview guide, had a dialogue with them which was tape-recorded and subsequently written up to become 'the data'. It is what, as sociologists, we would call semi-structured in-depth interviewing. Described like this, it is a respected technique with well known and often discussed problems and difficulties.

The difference, of course, is that, instead of asking people about now or the past year, I was asking people about a segment of their lives some fifty to eighty years ago. This difficulty is inherent in the method and has been discussed at length by the practioners of oral history. Paul Thompson (1978, 100-113) defends the interview which is retrospective over a long time span by citing evidence from psychology to show that much of the discarding from memory happens in a relatively short time span and is therefore a problem for most interviews.

But memory is more profoundly selective than this suggests, as Thompson recognises. Memory is not a simple store-room of all that a person experiences. Even thinking of it as a store-room from which some items get discarded will not do. For what is noticed in the first instance is inevitably selective, and so what is available for recall is far from total. Also the image of storing the inert is inappropriate. Memories are constantly available for modification; the past can be reinterpreted.

The selectivity of memory can, in some circumstances, become valuable information in itself. Thompson, for example, argues: 'The discovery of distortion or suppression in a life-story is not, it must be emphasized, purely negative; it may provide an important clue to the family's psychology and social attitudes'. But in the case of my data, such difficulties are not claimed as a virtue. Beyond checking that the details provided in an interview

were internally consistent and that details of specific places and events did not contradict other respondents' accounts, I have no way of assessing significant absences or distortion in the content of an interview. Nor do I feel confident to assume, as Gittins (1981) does, that the willingness of a respondent to speak on a particular topic and the amount said reflects the importance of that topic in their life. In my case, I do not feel confident that the uneven development of topics is not an unintended product of the interview.

All sources of data have their difficulties. There are difficulties unique to oral history, but I find these acceptable: that is they do not prevent me from using this method. I am prepared to live with them and am asking the reader to do the same.

Before leaving problems unique to the method entirely, there is one additional matter which is on the borderline between the two types of difficulty referred to above. I have talked of a semi-structured in-depth interview and of the use of an interview guide. This means that I had a set of topic headings and some specific questions under each heading before starting the interview, but that I would also 'play it by ear' as the interview proceeded. Thus if the respondent was saying something particularly interesting I would encourage the flow by appropriate responses and additional prompting questions. This is normal procedure for this method but researchers vary in how much they allow the respondent to determine the order

and pace of the interview. Any particular balance has its own difficulties.

The use of the term 'life story' indicates a particular preference among oral history practitioners for unobtrusive interviewing. The idea behind this term is that what is being collected is the respondent's story not the interviewer's. In practice, of course the story is the product of the interaction between interviewer and respondent, even when the former takes a low profile. Thompson (1981, 294) recognises this: 'But the life story method is based on a combination of exploration and questioning, within the context of a dialogue with the informant. It is a basic assumption of this dialogue that the researcher comes to learn the unexpected as well as the expected; and also that the overall framework within which information is given is determined not by the researcher, but by the informant's view of his or her own life.' Here the emphasis is placed on the role of the respondent but the influence of the interviewer can never be negligible to the point of irrelevance.

The least structured approach to the interview would involve the interviewer in having almost nothing by way of an interview guide. I did not choose that path. I had a long list of topics I wished to cover, translated into sample open-ended questions.

But even given such an interview guide there were different ways I could orient to the interview, each with

its own difficulties. I could choose a more structured approach and treat the interview guide like a schedule, thus controlling the topics and their sequence. This would have run the risk of failing to reach an understanding of aspects of the respondent's life in her or his own terms, and of totally missing events of significance to the respondent. Or I could choose to 'play it by ear' to the full, thus allowing a reshuffling of topics and the introduction of new topics. This would have made it extremely difficult to collect information on the same topics from each respondent systematically, thus reducing the extent to which comparisons can be made between respondents and the extent to which generalisations can be made from the material.

I intended to err on the structured side. While prepared to prompt and encourage free flow once a respondent was on a topic, I wished to ensure each topic was covered and, at least, control the order of topics. In practice I often allowed people to wander wherever they wanted, whenever they wanted. At the time I did not have the strength or the will to do anything else. In the context of the interviews it often seemed only right and fair that people should put together a string of memories of their choosing while I tried to fit in my questions as best I could. Despite myself, memorising a list of topics, I sometimes got lost and could not remember what had not been asked. Also interruptions and limits on respondent's and my time further reduced the 'complete' interviews. So

while I did manage to cover some topics systematically, I did not achieve complete coverage of every topic..

I now wish to turn to a problem which was entirely of my own making. To put it bluntly, the data I collected was not collected for the purpose to which I subsequently put it. I had not conceived of talking about accounts of the development of 'the modern family' when I collected the data. Thus the questions that I asked respondents were not asked with the primary intention of building up a picture of their family life which could then be put against a picture of 'the modern family'.

This is no minor detail and has caused me considerable anguish. It is indeed part of the biography of the work, which is a part of my own life story. I started a PhD in 1974. I spent the first year on a completely different topic. I was interested in why people decided to get married and why they decided to have children. At the same time I kept wondering how to do a PhD and why nobody would tell me the secret, hardly suspecting that there was no secret and that you just had to 'get on with it'. In despair I changed topics. In the process of reading around my original topic I became interested the notion of 'adulthood'. This lead to further reading on the process of 'growing up'. Eventually I decided to do a study of 'growing up in Scotland in the early 1900s'.

At this stage one of my two supervisors, Mike Anderson, was inaccessible, on a sabbatical leave. This was

unfortunate as he is the historian of my two supervisors. I launched forth to collect histories of 'growing up' from people born around 1900 with what, in retrospect, was probably an insufficient grounding in the history of the period. Nevertheless, I learned reasonably quickly and collected interesting material. My intentions were never very clearly defined, however. At best the idea was a rerun of aspects of Thompson's The Edwardians focusing more specifically on childhood and adolescence in Scotland, particularly young people's relationships with their parents and how these changed as they got older. Like Thompson I wanted to make comparisons between classes and genders.

There is, of course, no list of people born around 1900 from which to sample. I found my working-class respondents by approaching senior citizens clubs, particularly lunch clubs, and through day care centres and sheltered housing. A middle-class sample proved more difficult, I advertised with little success, but was helped by two housing associations and a small number of GPs.

By the end of 1977 I had collected the bulk of the material and transcribed the tapes using a mixture of verbatim quotes and summary. In early 1978 I entered full-time employment. First I was research associate on project in the general area of 'fertility'. Through working collaboratively with Kathryn Backett and Tom McGlew I probably learned more about 'doing research' in eighteen months than I had on my own in the previous three years. However, I had little time for my thesis. I then moved

into a post as a lecturer in 'family sociology'. With the joy and terror of the first few years of teaching, combined with the uncertainties of temporary contract, my thesis remained firmly on the shelf.

It was not until 1981 that I returned to it with seriousness for a sustained period. By then my interests had shifted and I found I was no longer happy with a straight forward piece of oral history. I wished to fuse the material with the insights I had gained through teaching family sociology. Eventually the present structure for using the material emerged.

The material I had collected can do the job to which I have put it, as I hope the remainder of the thesis demonstrates. However, it is undoubtedly the case that, if I had know what I know now at the outset, the task would have been much easier and the better for it. There is no doubt, of course, that a lot of researchers end up saying this (Platt,1976) but I am afraid this work has had a particularly convoluted history.

With the exception of the caveats expressed in chapter three, I hope this exhausts the difficulties which should be kept in mind when reading what follows. And I would therefore like to end this brief introduction on a more positive note. I have spoken of the difficulties unique to the method of oral history. It has also, of course, unique benefits. It can reveal more of the quality of everyday life for more sectors of the population than most

documentary sources. Paul Thompson (1978, 1981) stresses in particular the contribution of oral history to family history.

Families have life-cycles but we often assume that 'family' means one particular stage of the family life-cycle, that of child-rearing. The most studied 'family', by sociologists, is that of parents with dependent children. This work is somewhat less narrowly focused on one life-cycle stage, since I follow respondents through their school years into their early twenties.

Moreover, the standard formula for investigating families at the child-rearing stage is to interview the parents, or more usually one parent, typically the mother. In this work the family is seen, of necessity, through the eyes of the child and the young adult. The majority of parents who were having children in the era 1890 - 1910 are long dead. Thus, we cannot ask them about their families. In so far as it is necessary to infer parents' attitudes this is yet another difficulty. But it is also a refreshing correction to the automatic adoption of the parent's point of view. There are of course considerable practical and ethical difficulties in interviewing children. Here the use of retrospective interviews is actually able to circumvent some of the difficulties which would otherwise be present.

CHAPTER TWO

ACCOUNTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF 'THE MODERN FAMILY'

A number of authors have offered abstract accounts¹ of the development of 'the modern family'. I am not referring to those who have restricted themselves to painstaking historical research on some particular aspect of family life. Rather, the reference is to authors prepared to paint a picture of the development of the modern family using broad sweeps. Actual authors do not fall neatly into one of two categories: 'grand theorist' and 'painstaking empiricist'. The drawing of the line is arbitrary. Moreover, I have not included all authors who have a claim to the former title.² I hope, however, that I have included those authors who are significantly influencing current British discussion of the emergence of the modern family.³

The authors themselves come from a variety of backgrounds. In addition to the 'sentiments school' (Aries, Shorter, Stone)⁴, there are representatives of functionalism (Parsons, Goode), Marxism (Zaretsky), French Structuralism (Foucault, Donzelot) and neo-Freudianism (Lasch). The accounts are competing: they offer different motors of change, and often look to different sectors of the population for the origins of change. This has consequences for their anticipation of the timing and sequencing of events.

Despite representing a number of distinct, indeed competing, schools of thought, these authors identify essentially similar characteristics of the family as marking the emergence of its modern form. That is, they point to similar disjunctions between the features of the modern family and previous family forms.⁵ Moreover, they

all suggest that the modern family was established by the beginning of the 20th Century.⁶

There are obviously limits on the extent to which data on one specific time period can be brought to bear on broad-sweep, abstract accounts of development, as discussed in chapter three. But I will nevertheless try to use my data on the early 1900s in two ways. The first is to ask if the essential features of the modern family were indeed present in this period. The second is a much more tentative use. It may be that a detailed analysis of family life, for particular sectors of the population in one time period, can help evaluate competing accounts. This can be illustrated by a hypothetical example. Imagine that one account anticipates the modern family as emerging first among the middle class and then the working class, while another account reverses this sequence. In this case detailed information on the extent of the development of the features of the modern family in working-class and middle-class households at a particular time period might help clarify the situation.

Most of the remainder of this chapter is devoted to summarising the accounts themselves. I will then turn to their similarities and differences. The accounts are not presented in any particular order, although the extent of Parsons' influence on family sociology makes him an almost automatic first choice.

Parsons and Goode

Parsons

The distinctively modern family is seen by Parsons as

one outcome of societal evolution through the process of structural differentiation. Societies have evolved from relatively undifferentiated structures (in which almost all areas of social life are dominated by kinship) to complex societies with many differentiated and distinct institutions which are dissociated from kinship structures. In this functionalist account⁷ institutions typically emerge only because they fulfil some function for society. It automatically follows, therefore, that as other institutions proliferate, the functions performed by kinship structures, including the family, decline: '... what has recently been happening to the American family constitutes part of one of these stages of a process of differentiation. This process has involved a further step in the reduction of the importance in our society of kinship units other than the nuclear family. It has also resulted in the transfer of a variety of functions from the nuclear family to other structures of the society, notably the occupationally organised sectors of it.' (Parsons and Bales, 1956, 9)

To indicate this loss of functions of the family to the occupational structure, Parsons refers to the fact that children no longer typically look to their parents to provide their future livelihood. He refers to the development of wage work and the decline of family business, to the physical separation of the household and the place of work.

Thus Parsons links the development of the modern family particularly to the development of the occupationally organised sectors of society. He describes

the modern occupational system as having particular features. Geographic and social mobility are required of the labour force. Individuals are allocated to jobs according to their demonstrated ability to perform in them with competence. The allocation of jobs on this basis requires an open market and a mobile labour force. It is an occupational system characterised by competition, in which the standards used to evaluate individuals are almost in opposition to the value system characteristic of kinship groups:⁸ 'The patterns of behavior institutionalized in the modern occupational system run counter to many of the most deep-seated of human needs and motivations, such as relatively unconditional loyalty to groups, sentimental attachments to persons as such, the need for security against competitive pressures, and the like.' (Parsons, 1959, 261)

The process Parsons describes is not simply a negative paring away of the functions of kinship structures, including the family, nor a simple transfer of these functions to other insitutions. Those functions which do remain with the family take on a new importance and require more careful management. Hence he describes the family as more 'specialised' than previous family forms. Precisely because the occupational structure runs counter to deep-seated human needs, the creating and maintaining of appropriate personalities who can function in this occupational sphere is harder to achieve.

The structure of the modern family, a relatively isolated small group consisting of parents and children⁹, is suited to its specialised functions. The relative isolation and self-containment of the modern family has

permitted the increased emotional intensity of relationships within it. This is needed for the task of creating and maintaining personalities equipped for the occupational world. For example, it is the manipulation of love in childrearing which creates in the young the independence and self-reliance ultimately needed in the occupational world.¹⁰

This dovetailed evolution not only involved an increase in affect within the relatively isolated family as competition increased in the fluid occupational world, but it also involved an exaggeration of the division of labour between men and women: '... far from implying an erasure of the differentiation of sex roles; in many respects it reinforces and clarifies it' (Parsons and Bales, 1956, 23). The two spheres of family and occupation must be kept separate so that the institutionalised pattern of behaviour in one does not interfere with the other. And yet they must be locked together at some point if the family is to serve the occupational structure. The solution which has evolved is that the woman remains at home and that the man goes out to work. The man provides the link between the two spheres. He is the hinge which locks them together.

Parsons not only stresses the importance of developments in the occupational structure but also the role played by educational institutions. The family must be complemented by the school, which teaches the values of competitive achievement. But it is the child who has already had a good training in independence who does well at school.

Thus, in the evolutionary process of structural differentiation, there are simultaneous changes in the

structure and function of particular institutions. These changes are locked to changes in the structure and function of other institutions. Therefore an integrated social structure emerges. An integrated social structure is mirrored by an integrated value system. Cultural values, such as the values of the occupational sphere (universalism and achievement), and personality types similarly undergo a dovetailed evolution.

Critics have complained that Parsons' concern with 'the structural patterning of evolutionary development' (1966, 111) is too divorced from historical realities.¹¹ In the case of the family Parsons comes close to talking empirical details. He discusses both the internal dynamics of the family and the relationship between the family and other institutions - the occupational system, the peer group, and the school. His account of the development of the family, however, remains at a high level of abstraction.

A focus on an evolutionary process effected by structural differentiation does not foster concern for the sequencing of events. He does not, for example, comment on whether or not you would expect the division of labour between men and women to become exaggerated after childrearing practices have become more emotionally intense. At a high level of abstraction these events may be characterised as interlocked aspects of an evolutionary process with no essential sequence. However, the dominant example Parsons gives when discussing the discontinuity between the modern family and previous family forms is that of the separation of production and consumption. Here Parsons emphasises the importance of the development of

separate institutions for production, of a separate occupational sector, a separate economy. Similarly, at the level of culture, the development to which he attaches most significance is the diffusion of the 'dominant values',¹² of universalism and achievement. These are the values of the modern occupational sphere. This does not amount to saying that the economy always leads structural differentiation but does encourage that impression.

As for the timing of the emergence of the modern family, for Parsons the major transformation occurred with the separation of production and consumption. Parsons also talks of structural differentiation as a continuing process. For example, as late as 1962 Parsons talked of current changes in the occupational sphere with consequences for the family: 'The most important example is that of the higher levels of masculine occupational roles, in which (in those with technical emphasis) the requisite levels of training and competence are continually rising' (1962, 167). This in turn meant, he argued, a higher level of competence is demanded of women in the psychological management of their husbands and their children, the future workers.

At the same time, structural differentiation was not evenly diffused throughout the entire society. There were backwaters like the modern American family farm - sectors of society which were outwith the modern occupational structure. Indeed, Parsons concluded that the modern family form was most developed among those sectors of the society most geared to competition within the occupational structure. Therefore, the vanguard were the urban middle class.¹³

Goode

Goode¹⁴(1970) is often described as modifying and elaborating Parsons' account (Harris, 1969; Morgan, 1975). The modifications demonstrate sympathy with certain critiques of Parsons.¹⁵ As noted, Parsons can be read as indicating that the economy leads the process of structural differentiation and thus that the family is shaped to 'fit' the occupational sphere of industrial society. Goode emphasises that there is not an automatic 'fit' between family and industrial society. This, he argues, is demonstrated by paying more attention than Parsons to systematic class difference in the development of the modern family.

When Goode talks of the spread of the modern family (like Parsons, he calls it the conjugal family), he refers to the increased acceptance of a particular model of family life. The model includes both an empirical reality, a particular pattern of family interaction, and an ideology. The essence of his account of class differences in the take-up of this model is this: 'lower classes' have moved more rapidly towards the empirical reality than others, and the more educated classes have more readily adopted the ideology than others.

Lower-class families are first to match the empirical pattern of family interaction because they are least able to resist integration into the industrial system. The demands of the market for mobility operate against extended kin ties. The extension to women and young people of the opportunity of earning an individual wage undermines traditional patterns of authority. Lower-class families

have neither the resources nor the will to resist such pressures towards integration into the industrial system.

Upper classes can often maintain or increase their domination of resources in times of economic change. The same pressures to change, then, do not weigh on the upper classes. And yet, Goode suggests, the educated classes are more susceptible to changing their ideas, by virtue of their education. Thus the educated classes' acceptance of the ideology of the modern family outstrips their practice.

Goode uses his account of class differences to reach general conclusions about the 'fit' between the family and the industrial system: 'The different adjustment of families in different classes to the industrial system emphasizes the independence of the two sets of variables, the familial and the industrial, as well as the presence of some "disharmonies" between the two.' (1970,15)

Goode goes beyond this to assert both the possibility of the family as an independent variable influencing the diffusion of the industrial system and the possibility of additional intervening variables influencing both the family and the industrial system. In particular, Goode talks about the role of ideology in effecting change: 'One important source of change is the ideology of "economic progress" and technological development, as well as the ideology of the conjugal family, and spokesmen for both appear in non-Western countries before any great changes are observable either in industrial or family areas of life.' (1970, 19)

Both ideologies have their roots in 'individualistic

philosophy', which is in turn rooted in Protestantism: 'Serious debates about laissez faire economics, political liberty, industrialization, and the new family system all had their roots in that same individualistic philosophy, rooted ultimately in Protestantism.' (1970, 23)

Thus Goode, while sharing much of Parsons' understanding of the structure and function of the modern family, departs from the highly abstract Parsonian account of structural differentiation. He also seeks to counterbalance the notion of the primacy of the occupational values and the implication that the industrial system¹⁶ causally preceded the conjugal family. By stressing the independent role of an ideology rooted in Puritanism he is adopting an account which has affinity with the 'sentiments approach' historians.¹⁷

Zaretsky

Like Parsons, for Zaretsky a main characteristic of the pre-modern family is the lack of separation between family and economic activity. He identifies two stages to the development of the modern family. In the first stage, early capitalism, the ideological changes which were associated with the diffusion of the capitalist system¹⁸ included a new attitude to the family: 'Capitalism, in its early development, distinguished itself from previous societies by the high moral and spiritual value it placed upon labour spent in goods production. This new esteem for production, embodied in the idea of private property and in the Protestant idea of "calling", led the early bourgeoisie to place a high value upon the family since the family was the basic unit of production.' (1976, 28)

Thus Zaretsky argues that the bourgeoisie, in particular, (as the carriers of the capitalist system, the capitalists) conducted their family life self-consciously and developed sets of rules to govern their family life. The value placed on the family was raised with the value placed on production. At this stage 'the division between the family and the world of commodity production'¹⁹ had not effectively developed. For Zaretsky it was not until the 19th century that this separation initiated the second stage in the development of the family: 'Early capitalism developed a high degree of consciousness concerning the internal life of the family and a rather elaborate set of rules and expectations governed family life While there was an intense division of labour within the family, based upon age, sex and family position, there was scarcely a division between the family and the world of commodity production, at least not until the 19th century.' (1976, 28)

The second stage of the development of the modern family, according to Zaretsky, is initiated by the rise of industrial capitalism and the pervasive separation of much productive work from the family: 'With the rise of industry, capitalism "split" material production between its socialised forms (the sphere of commodity production) and the private labour performed predominantly by women within the home' (1976, 29). Thus capital in its pursuit of surplus value reorganised labour such that it created the division between commodity production and domestic labour, the public and the private, 'work' and home, men and women. This reorganisation in production was again accompanied by

ideological change.²⁰ The bourgeoisie still exalted the family but now the family was perceived as a sphere of personal freedom in contrast to society: 'The production of exchange value was removed from the family and vested in large-scale, "impersonal" corporate units. But rather than destroying the traditional bourgeois family life this transformation gave it a new meaning as the realm of happiness, love and individual freedom.' (1976, 80)

This ideal of the family also pervaded petty bourgeois and proletarian family life. Zaretsky argues that the family took on new significance for large sectors of the population at this stage, as larger proportions of the population were unable to gain identity through work or private property. The separation of family and 'work' for the mass of people left no space other than this 'separated-off' family in which identity could be realised. The lack of alternative means of realising identity gave rise to a diffused need to be valued 'for themselves' which the family could satisfy: 'Proletarianisation gave rise to subjectivity. The family became the major sphere of society in which the individual could be foremost - it was the only place that proletarians owned.' (1976, 61)

The separation of family and commodity production had consequences for the sexual division of labour. In the first stage the work which women did within the family was recognised as integral to the productive activity of the family as a whole. In the second stage this recognition of women's work as productive was lost. Although women were working for capital by reproducing the labour force, their

relationship to capital is obscured by the apparent private nature of their work.²¹

Thus the force which has shaped the modern family is the inexorable logic of capital in its pursuit of a docile and manageable labour force from which to extract surplus value. It is this that has created the split between the family and work which has constituted the family as a private, bounded entity, which has exacerbated the division of labour between the sexes and which has made possible the indulgence of children. Thus the scene was set by the bourgeoisie, the dominant class, prior to industrialisation. With industrialisation the whole of society is transformed.

Marxist-feminist authors²² have modified this account. They argue that the interests of capital alone cannot explain the form of the modern family but that we need also to look at the conflicting interests of the sexes. For example Heidi Hartman argues: 'Zaretsky largely denies the existence and importance of inequality between men and women. His focus is on the relationship of women, the family, and the private sphere to capitalism. Moreover, even if capitalism created the private sphere, as Zaretsky argues, why did it happen that women work there, and men in the labor force? Surely this cannot be explained without reference to patriarchy, the systematic dominance of men over women.' (Hartman, 1979, 5)

Hartman talks of a partnership between patriarchy and capital. Anne Phillips (1980) argues that the conflicts between men and women often set the terms of the conflict between capital and labour: 'It is not that there is a

struggle between capital and labour, and a struggle between men and women, as though the two operate independently of one another; the working class which capitalism has to deal with is already defined by division into two sexes.' (1980, 22)

Thus the motor of change becomes the crosscutting struggles of conflicting interest between men and women and between labour and capital.

In a section entitled 'Personal life and subjectivity in the twentieth-century United States' he adds a picture of more recent changes associated with advanced capitalism. These amount to a subset of the charges referred to by Lasch, discussed below. Zaretsky talks of how the family is unable to escape the tensions of the wider social world. He refers, for example, to 'the generation gap' created by the different experiences of parents and children in a world where mass media, extensive fashions in consumption and mass education are recent phenomena. Although he refers to the 'depersonalisation' of personal life as a consequence (75), he remains more optimistic than Lasch. He notes that the emergence of a separate sphere of personal life spawned a number of radical movements and retains the potential for doing so (109-127).

Lasch, Donzelot

Donzelot is an associate of the French structuralist Foucault and draws heavily on his work (Foucault, 1980). Of this pair, I will concentrate on Donzelot, since his work focuses specifically on the family. Lasch is not of

the same stable but, nevertheless, I believe he gives a sufficiently similar account for consideration at the same time. There are also similarities between these accounts and those discussed in the previous section. This is not surprising since all these authors draw on Marxist analysis although only Lasch is referred to as a Marxist (Barrett and McIntosh 1982).

Again they name the bourgeoisie as the class where the modern family was first to be found. Here the accounts give the impression of the bourgeoisie, in the period of incipient capitalism, grappling with an anomalous class position and carving out a position of strength for themselves. Foucault talks of the bourgeoisie developing a sexuality, an economy of the body which distinguished them from aristocracy and proletariat alike. Rather more conventionally Lasch talks of their embracing of the Protestant concept of 'calling'. In either case, the practice and ideology adopted was part of a distinctive pattern of domestic life.

This distinctive pattern of domestic life is transposed from the bourgeoisie to other sectors of the population. In the accounts of Foucault and Donzelot this is a process of imposition. In other terms, having developed their own domestic economy with its pattern of consumption and saving, expression and reserve, the bourgeoisie sought to impose the same economy on the proletariat. It is the particular stress on the imposed nature of the change for much of the population which distinguishes these accounts from Zaretsky's, also that the course of the change is not as simple as capital's pursuit of surplus value.

In explaining this imposition, reference is made to the needs of capitalism for a plentiful and docile or manageable labour force. But it is very clear in the work of Foucault and Donzelot that the attempts at controlling domestic life were simply one facet of a general and pervasive development in the use of power.²³ For these two authors in particular the transformation in society from pre-modern to modern is characterised by a shift in the use of power. Foucault talks of a shift from a time in which power was exercised simply to forbid or to otherwise take away from people, to a time in which it is exercised in multifarious subtle ways which not only restrict and restrain but rechannel and incite behaviour. The term 'administering' aptly characterises the modern use of power. This process is clearly linked by these authors to the development of capitalism and quickened by the development of industrialisation. Lasch has a certain affinity with this view, as he too refers to general attacks on pre-industrial customs in an attempt to create ordered, categorised and administrable persons.

Although the term 'imposed' is used, this cannot be read as analogous to 'physically forced' but stands for a much more subtle operation. The term 'imposed' might also suggest that a pattern is being printed on a passive recipient. This would also be a misreading of these authors' works. Foucault and Donzelot are careful to emphasise that each new technique of deploying power brings with it its own form of resistance. And at the same time, successful incitement to behave in particular ways by definition requires the active taking-up of these ways by the majority of the incited.

The components of this process of 'imposition' particularly emphasised by Foucault and Donzelot are the supervision of children such that their behaviour can be channelled and directed, and the encapsulation of married women in the home where they are exhorted to create domestic bliss. For Donzelot, women are almost agents of the 'imposition'. Writing about France, he argues that women were not only charged with the supervision of children but incited to entice their husbands off the street, out of the cabaret and into the home. Thus working-class women helped draw working class men into the close circle of family supervision. Thus the imposition on women was not a passive one but one taken up by women because, Donzelot suggests, the new domestic power gained by women was an improvement over the previous balance of power between the sexes.

As for the other agents of the 'imposition', all these authors agree in the naming of the medical profession, including psychiatry and psychoanalysis, and in naming the professional educators. The latter were mainly concerned with the supervision of children. The former divided their attention primarily between women and children. Thus various agents, each with a somewhat different purpose, helped transform the domestic economy of the working class.

Donzelot, like Foucault, is careful to argue that the transformation of the working-class family involved different deployments of power and different strategies from the transformation of the bourgeoisie. This is the difference between techniques designed to strengthen one's own position and techniques designed to control others. For example, in discussing the supervision of children he

notes the difference in the strategy adopted in the case of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat: 'The first was centered on the spread of household medicine, that is a set of knowledges and techniques designed to enable the bourgeois classes to rescue their children from the negative influence of servants and to place them under the parents' observation. The second aimed at the consolidation, under the label of "social economy", of all the forms of direction of the life of the poor, so as to diminish the social cost of their reproduction and obtain an optimum number of workers at minimum public expense: in short what is customarily termed philanthropy.' (1979,16)

Lasch picks up this thread, but argues that in the end the bourgeoisie are hoist by their own petard. He describes the 'bourgeois family system' as reaching its full flower in the 19th century. This is the period in which the bourgeois family most approximates the ideology of 'a haven in a heartless world'. But at the same time as the family was so exalted, there was also the growing conviction that the family was not up to the job of socialising children and maintaining decent minds and bodies. The dissatisfaction with the family may have focused on the proletarian family, but the cure also affected the bourgeoisie. Lasch argues that the means created to bolster the family had the effect of indiscriminately undermining its essential features. Donzelot also believes that in the end all families are available to State intervention. Indeed, he refers to the family as a 'missionary field' without qualification in terms of a particular class.

From the nineteenth century on, a whole barrage of 'back-ups' to the family were developed. School, for example, was viewed as making up for the deficiencies of the home. But as legislation was passed and professional 'helpers' were created to 'back up' the family, so the 'haven in the heartless world' was invaded by the very world from which it was supposed to provide shelter. As a neo-Freudian, Lasch believes that the 'invasion' of the family has profound consequences for character formation. Parental authority is undermined, the 'powerful union of love and discipline'²⁴ destroyed, and characters consequently impoverished²⁵. Both Donzelot and Lasch note that the 'policing of families' has the consequence of the loosening of parental authority and the emphasising of the rights of the individual rather than family obligations.

Lasch argues that, as the private, bounded nature of the family has been corroded, so the emotional intensity within has drained away. The family can therefore no longer offer the 'independence training' which requires the potent combination of love and discipline to be wielded by parents. This process of corrosion dates from the 19th century but has been boosted considerably in the post-industrial stage of capitalism. In a society in which the emphasis has shifted from hard work to consumption such training is no longer even desirable. Paraphrasing Fromm, Lasch states that 'late bourgeois society needs men and women who feel free but act as the information apparatus prompts them to' (1977,89). He notes that the ideology of the helping professionals 'anticipated the needs of a society based not on hard work but on consumption, the search for personal fulfilment, and the management of

interpersonal relations' (1977,102). Although he does not offer precise dates, there is a suggestion that these more recent developments are post World War 2.

To summarise, for these authors the motor of change can only crudely be referred to as the transition to a capitalist mode of production. What is emphasised in their accounts is the way in which the deployment of power was refined and diversified in order to further economy in the general sense. Power was utilised to promote savings, to promote a more efficient usage of all manner of things. Such economies were first developed among the bourgeoisie and included a domestic economy designed to preserve and foster their own strength of mind and body. But a domestic economy was also 'imposed' on the proletariat in order to minimise their cost to and maximise their contribution to the public economy.

However, this 'imposition' is more complex than the active stamping the passive. Women were recruited not only to supervise their children more closely but also to turn their husbands energies outside 'work' into the home. At the same time the family was opened to surveillance and 'backed up' by helping professions. This missionary invasion of the family was justified by an assertion of the sanctity of individual rights as being greater than the sanctity of the family.

None of the authors offers precise sequencing and timing of events. Lasch would put the invasion of the family as beginning in the 19th century and taking a new form in much more recent years. Donzelot discusses evidence of the 'imposition' from the 18th to the 20th century.

Aries. Shorter. Stone

Although offering very different accounts these authors can be discussed together since they all discuss the role of ideas and feelings in bringing about the modern family. In this I am following the categorising strategy used by Anderson (1980) when he discusses these authors under the heading 'The Sentiments Approach'.²⁶

For Shorter, the motor of change is the 'surge of sentiment'. It is as if human kind has been waiting for the correct circumstances to trigger or remove barriers to an onrush of natural sentiment. Aries and Stone emphasise changes in meaning and ideas as the precipitates of family change: both attribute considerable significance to changes in religious views. Stone concentrates on the growth of 'the principle of affective individualism', fostered by Protestantism. Aries focuses on the influence of religious educators and moralists on ideas of child nature. Aries too makes reference to the innate. He believes that there is a given human nature which we have slowly learned to recognise. Rather than the family being transformed by the accidental creation of conditions which allowed the expression of innate feelings, it was transformed by deliberate changes, initiated by the efforts of moralists and pedagogues, based on increased understanding of human and particularly child nature.²⁷

Shorter

Shorter discusses three surges of sentiment. The first in the sequence is that of the romantic revolution, the upsurge of romantic love, which he links explicitly to capitalism: 'How did capitalism help cause that powerful

thrust of sentiment among the unmarried that I have called the romance revolution? To what extent may sleeping around before marriage and choosing partners on the basis of personal attraction rather than wealth be associated with economic change? The principal link here is the increased participation of young unmarried people, especially women, in the free-market labour force. The logic of the market place positively demands individualism Egoism that was learned in the market place became transferred to community obligations and standards, to ties to the family and lineage - in short, to the whole domain of cultural rules that regulated familial and sexual behaviour.' (1977, 253)

Thus the class in which this transformation first occurred was working class. The time coincides with the development of a market economy offering employment to women as well as men. The period of most significant change is that of 'the enormous rise in illegitimacy' between 1750 and 1850 (1977, 89).

The second surge in sentiments was that of maternal love. This developed first among the bourgeoisie and overlaps in time with the first surge. Shorter argues that maternal love could only develop when women had sufficient time free from other burdens to devote to their infants. Capitalism brought material benefits first to the bourgeoisie who owned the means of production. They were the first to experience a rise in the standard of living, and a reduction of toil: 'As family income increased, women could exchange the grim pressures of production for the work of infant care' (1977, 259). And according to Shorter

this is what women did.

This 'crystallisation of maternal affection' occurred among the middle classes in the late 18th century and early 19th century. Among the 'lower class' the decades of the 19th century after 1860 constituted the period of most rapid change. 'By the beginning of the twentieth century, the great transformation of mothering was virtually complete.' (1977, 195)

The surge in maternal love was linked in turn to the third surge in sentiment, that of domesticity. Shorter defines domesticity as 'the family's awareness of itself as a precious emotional unit that must be protected with privacy and isolation from outside intrusion' (ibid, 225).²⁸ This onrush of domestic intimacy was almost contemporaneous with the surge in maternal love. It could not have preceded maternal love because 'the emotional centre of intimacy was the tiny infant' (1977, 261).

Maternal love and domesticity were more important than romantic love in providing the 'nucleus about which the modern family was to crystallize' (1977, 204). Thus it was the middle classes who first experienced the domesticity distinctive of the modern nuclear family. As for the working class, Shorter suggests mid-nineteenth century as 'the take-off point of worker domesticity' (1977, 229).

Aries

Aries focuses on the development of the idea of childhood which he believes is inextricably linked with the development of the idea of the family. He talks of the development of 'an awareness of the particular nature of childhood, that particular nature which distinguishes the child from the adult, even the young adult' (1973, 125).

Thus he documents the move from complete absence of childhood in mediaeval times to 'the centering of the family around the child in the nineteenth century' (1973, 8).

Aries too sees the middle-class family as the first to adopt a modern pattern of domesticity, but the primary agents of the change are external to the family: '... churchmen or gentlemen of the robe, few in number before the sixteenth century, and a far greater number of moralists in the seventeenth century, eager to ensure disciplined, rational manners. they saw [children] as fragile creatures of God who needed to be both safeguarded and reformed. This concept in its turn passed into family life.' (1973, 129)

In the 18th century, concern with hygiene and physical health further contributed to the revised attitude to children. Like the authors in the previous section, Aries attributes considerable importance to the influence of moralists, educators and physicians on the development of the modern family.

Centering the family around the child involves the adoption of a privatised pattern of domesticity, the separation-off of the family from the wider social world. The round of sociability of the pre-modern period was inimical to such a private, domestic life.

Aries talks of an intermediate phase in the development of the modern family exhibited by seventeenth century middle-class families. At this stage the idea of childhood has taken root, but the old pattern of sociability has not yet withered away: 'In the eighteenth

century, the family began to hold society at a distance, to push it back beyond a steadily extending zone of private life.' (1973, 385) That private space itself was partitioned to afford further protection from the outside world and to separate children from contaminating contact from adults within as well as without.

Like Parsons, Aries suggests that as the distance between family members and others grew so the emotional intensity of family members increased: 'Here children as they really are, and the family as it really is, with its everyday joys and sorrows, have emerged from an elementary routine to reach the brightest zones of consciousness.' (1973, 389). He is not suggesting that parents never devoted themselves to their children in the pre-modern period, but suggests that there is a qualitative shift. In the pre-modern family a parent's emotional investment in their child was often contingent on their hopes concerning the future of the family as a collectivity. Aries says of the modern family that 'All the energy of the group is expended on helping the children to rise in the world, individually and without any collective ambition: the children rather than the family.' (1973, 390)

He does not offer any clear account of why this process develops first among the middle classes. Nor is 'middle class' clearly defined. He refers to the following sectors of the population in addition to the middle class as first to adopt a modern family: nobles, richer artisans, and the richer labourers (ibid, 390). The suggestion is that only those who are sufficiently affluent can take up the idea of childhood and allow an extended period of

separation from the adult world. Hence there is some considerable lag before working classes develop a childhood for their children. This occurs sometime between the 18th century and the present but sufficiently distant from the present for us to have forgotten the 'aristocratic and middle-class origins' of family life.

Stone

Although all the main authors in the 'sentiments approach' remain influential, the model of family development offered by Stone has been adopted most readily by other authors (Thompson, 1981; Burnett, 1982). Stone concentrates on England in the period of the 16th to the 18th century.

Stone identifies three 'ideal types of family', that is he describes the essential features of three significant family types for three overlapping eras. These are the open lineage family, 1450 - 1630; the restricted patriarchal nuclear family, 1550 - 1700; and the closed domesticated nuclear family, 1640 - 1800. The shift from one family type to another is symptomatic of wider cultural change, of 'massive shifts in world views and value systems' (1979, 21).

The open lineage family is so named because of its openness to external influences, neighbours, clients and kin. That openness was eroded in the shift to the restricted patriarchal nuclear family. Speaking of the upper and middle classes Stone notes: 'Under pressure from the State and from Protestant moral theology it shifted from a predominantly open structure to a more restrictedly nuclear one. The functions of this nuclear family were now

more and more confined to the nurture and socialisation for the infant and young child, and the economic, emotional and sexual satisfaction of the husband and wife.²⁹ (1979, 145)

Stone also attributes a central role to religious ideas and thus the Reformation is the main event of the period. The Reformation shattered the unity of the moral order. Thereafter the ascendancy of Protestant moral theology and the State was fuelled by the fear of moral chaos, a feature of the post-Reformation era of competing religious ideologies. The emphasis placed on the patriarchal family by Protestantism was a singling out of the household rather than the church as the primary agency of moral and religious control. It was the duty of the father to keep moral chaos at bay in his attendance to the upbringing of his family. The Reformation was followed by a wave of patriarchal authority.

This family type is quite distinctive from the closed domesticated nuclear family, in that relationships between family members are characterised by distance and deference. At this stage the father is the authoritarian patriarch. The transition to the third family type is a consequence of the growth in 'affective individualism'. Affective individualism equates the good of the individual with the public good.

The closest Stone offers to a definition of individualism is the following: 'Individualism is a very slippery concept to handle. Here what is meant is two rather distinct things: firstly, a growing introspection and interest in the individual personality; and secondly, a demand for personal autonomy and a corresponding respect for the individual's right to privacy, to self-expression,

and to the free exercise of his will within limits set by the need for social cohesion.' (1979, 151)

Stone connects the growth of individualism with the growth of a market economy, but also suggests the influence of Protestantism. For example, self-reflective prayer and personal study of the bible encourage introspection and respect for privacy. One 'critical development' (1979, 174) was the emergence of the entrepreneurial bourgeoisie as a significant social group. The ascendancy of this group furthered the growth of affective individualism in two ways: by embracing the principle themselves and by transmitting their beliefs to other strata. The interests of the bourgeoisie predispose them to be receptive to the principle of affective individualism. Their close links with the landed classes mean the easy transmission of ideas to these strata.

By 1750 the closed domestic nuclear family was well established in the upper and middle sectors of English society. However a new wave of patriarchal repression eradicated the possibility of further diffusion for nearly a century: 'When forward movement picked up again at the end of the nineteenth century, it involved a spread of the domesticated family ideal up into the higher court aristocracy and down into the masses of artisans and respectable wage-earners who composed the bulk of the population.' (1979, 22)

Stone does not discuss changes at the end of the 19th century in any detail. In a brief section entitled 'Post 1800 Family Types' he talks of a 'far more intensive phase of permissiveness, beginning slowly among the middle

classes in the 1870s, and spreading to the social elite in the 1890s; then, in the 1920s and more dramatically in the 1960s and 1970s, spreading for the first time to all sectors of the population.' (1979, 423).

This dating is not explained. It seems to be a reference to the 'roaring twenties' and 'swinging sixties'. The socio-demographic changes most often used to single out the 1960s and 1970s are indicators of a marked increase in pre-marital sexual activity (Socio-Demographic Research Group). But this form of 'permissiveness' is not a necessary condition for the closed domestic nuclear family and we cannot date its emergence in this way. It remains unclear precisely when, at what stage in the late 19th century and early 20th century, relationships within working-class families softened sufficiently to merit this title.

Similarities between Authors

For all the major differences between each of the authors discussed above - differences that will be explored as this thesis proceeds, some striking similarities can be identified. In all these accounts the emergence of the modern family is the outcome of major structural and ideational change, the origins of which significantly predate the 20th century. Not all authors would claim that the change was completed by the early 1900s. For example, for the sentiment school the final stage of the change, its diffusion to all sectors of the population, overlaps with the early 20th century. It is fair, however, to conclude that by the early 1900s for all sectors of the population the 'modern family' is either the

dominant or the ascendant family form.

The authors all identify a small number of essential characteristics of the modern family. The same four essential features of the modern family leap out of the majority of the accounts summarised above. In the few instances where this is not the case for a particular feature in a particular account, at the very least the feature is consonant with the account.

Firstly, all authors, with the exception of Lasch³⁰, agree that the modern family is distinctively separated-off from the wider social world: Parsons talks of its 'relative isolation'; for Zaretsky 'the family became the realm of "private life"' (1976, 57); Donzelot talks of the 'tactical constriction' of the bourgeois family and the 'turning back' on itself of the working-class family (1979, 45); Aries talks of the family 'holding society at a distance' (1973, 385); Shorter of the family as an inviolable domain; Stone of the shift from an open to a restricted structure. All are saying that the modern family has clearly marked boundaries between it and the rest of the social world; it is a discrete, bounded entity. Moreover, for the majority of authors this is not a simple physical or structural separation but a change in how the family is experienced.

Secondly, all authors, with the exception of Lasch³¹, agree that relationships within the modern family are distinctively emotionally intense. Authors discuss a qualitative change in the emotional and sexual relationship between husband and wife and in the bond between parents and children. The emphasis on the qualitative change towards more emotionally intense relationships is obviously

central to the accounts of the 'sentiments school'. But the other authors all clearly accept that the separation-off of the family from the wider social world was associated with an increase in the emotional intensity within its boundaries. Lasch is not outwith this framework in a general sense but believes that by the early 1900s this phase has already passed. Thus although approaching from different angles, all authors would agree with Goode's identification of the modern family as concerned with the individual's 'emotional input-output balance'.

A further elaboration of this view of the distinctive emotional intensity of the modern family is present in the accounts. It is that the emotional focus of the family has shifted to the child: the modern family is child-centred. This elaboration is explicit in the majority of the accounts and can otherwise be read in without effort, as reasonable extrapolation. This is developed in chapter five below.

Thirdly all authors agree that the modern family is distinguished by a recognition of the individual: the balance between the individual and the family has shifted in favour of the former. The child, for example, is no longer the servant of the family but an individual serviced by the family.

For Stone and Goode the philosophy of individualism is a prime mover of social change affecting relationships between men and women, adults and children. Thus the shift in emphasis away from the family (as the significant unit which must be preserved) to the individual (leaving the family as a voluntary association of individuals) is central in their accounts. Shorter similarly emphasises

the impact of individualism (but on the working class not the bourgeoisie). Lasch and Donzelot discuss the bourgeois emphasis on the individual but focus more on the State's contribution to the balance between the family and the individual. The State intervenes in the family in the name of the individual, and in particular in the name of the individual child. Indeed for Aries the rights of the individual arrive on the vehicle of the rights of the child: 'All the energy of the group is expended on helping the children to rise in the world, individually and without collective ambition: the children rather than the family'³² (1973, 390, also quoted above). For Parsons and Zaretsky an emphasis on the individual is an essential emergent component of the modern family, given the structural and ideological changes they describe.

Finally all authors agree that this discrete, bounded, emotionally intense family was also characterised by a greater segregation of sex-roles than was typical of previous family forms. This feature is given the most dramatic centrality in the account of Shorter when he talks of women's role in maternal affection and the creation of domesticity. But it is clear that all accounts assume a more complete division of labour between married men and women, with women focused more exclusively on the home, the site of childrearing and domestic work. In Donzelot's work this is an emergent feature of the working-class family provoked by State agents but effected with the collusion of women. In the accounts of Parsons and Zaretsky it is an aspect of structural changes. In other accounts this sex-role segregation is a taken-for-granted emergent feature of other changes. Only in certain feminist accounts does sex-

role segregation come close to the position of an independent causal factor shaping other features of the family.

The carriers of these features of the modern family are also a matter of some consensus. All agree that the middle class were first to exemplify them, and they then 'trickled down' to, or were imposed upon, or taken up by, the working class. So class is an essential aspect of most of these accounts, and the sequence of the emergence of the modern family in different classes is a matter of some significance in these accounts.

As well as agreement on the essential features of the modern family and their carriers, we have seen that there is also a fair consensus among these different authors on the timing of its emergence. The nineteenth century is crucial, and the modern family is assumed to be in existence by 1900 (although some further changes are allowed for the twentieth century, especially the 1960s and 1970s). The point is not merely one of chronology, but of causation. While the authors differ widely in their 'prime movers' (industrialism, structural differentiation, capitalism, individualism...), these prime movers have been features of Western society for longer than just this century. As I shall show in chapter four, Scotland in the early 1900s was (and had been for some time) the sort of society they had in mind as fostering the nuclear family.

So there is already a gross sense in which my data are relevant to an assessment of their accounts. The next chapter goes on to examine the extent to which that gross sense can be refined.

1. The term 'account' has been qualified by 'abstract' in order to make it clear that I am not referring to a detailed chronology of development. The word 'model' is perhaps as appropriate as 'abstract account', but I have been cautious of using the term 'model' since this sometimes conjures up visions of elaborately interlocking propositions. The majority of the models of development dealt with here are very simple. In the case of some of the authors discussed, notably Stone and Aries, it could be argued that they are writing nation specific histories, not abstract accounts. However, this is not how they are treated by many authors. For example, Sennet (1970) treats both Parsons and Aries as equally general accounts of the development of the modern family.

2. Zimmerman is an example of such an omission. His work is discussed by Lasch (1977) and included in the second edition of the Anderson (1980) reader, but he has had considerably less impact than the other authors discussed here.

3. Anderson (1980) provides an excellent overview of approaches to the history of the Western family. He discusses three approaches: 'the demographic', 'the sentiments' and 'the household economics'. Of these three schools I have found authors prepared to make grand sweeps only in the second. Several authors are discussed in this work to whom Anderson makes no reference. This is because he was concerned with 'histories', not abstract accounts.

4. Flandrin (1979) has been omitted, because his abstract account is less complete. Anderson (1980, 86) describes this work as 'A fragmented book which nevertheless provides invaluable insights and material on France and England, by

France's currently foremost family historian.'

5. I am, of course, oversimplifying somewhat. For example, the impression I have given that authors contrast a modern and pre-modern period and a modern and pre-modern family does not do justice to the richness and complexity of several accounts. All authors are to some extent aware of the unevenness of the development of the modern family in time and place.

6. The term 'suggest' is used because not all the authors do date the changes. However, I hope I demonstrate below that the emergence of the modern family by 1900 is implicit nevertheless.

7. Commentaries on and critiques of functionalism are many. For discussion of the impact of functionalist accounts on the sociology of the family, as well as general critique, see Harris (1969) and Morgan (1975).

8. Harris (1969, 111-116) suggests that the Parsonian characterisation of industrial society may be regarded as 'an analysis of an extreme type of society to which actual societies will approximate more and more as industrialisation progresses, but perhaps never reach' (115) See Harris (1977) for a more fundamental attack on the Parsonian opposition of 'family' and 'society'.

9. Parsons' assertion that the modern nuclear family is relatively isolated and therefore that the most important kin relationships are those contained within it produced a barrage of attempted refutations. Through empirical work, authors demonstrated the continued importance of wider kin, particularly grandparents and relationships between parents and their grown-up children. For contributions to this debate and Parsons' reply, see part four of the

Anderson (1980) reader.

10. For a discussion of the manipulation of love in 'independence training' see Parsons (1962, 167-169).

11. For example, see C. Wright Mills' (1967) comment on grand theorists in general and Parsons in particular.

12. The concept of 'dominant value' is controversial. See Harris (1969, 103 and 113 - 115; 1977).

13. What he had in mind when he used the term 'middle class' is worth noting. His primary indicator seems to be the achievement of an occupational position which requires educational qualifications of a particular level.

14. Goode is not a 'hard functionalist'. He is less concerned to demonstrate that society is a system of subsystems with integrated structure and function at every level. Rather he has a functionalist orientation which leads him to certain questions about the function of institutions and their ability to meet the needs of individuals (Morgan, 1975).

15. For example, Goode (1964; 1970) is careful to emphasise the continued importance of grandparents and links between grown-up children and parents.

16. Goode is criticised for his loose usage of 'industrialisation'. He acknowledges this weakness himself in his preface to the paperback edition (1970, xv-xvi)

17. Goode (1970) cites Stone (1965) approvingly in the introduction to the paperback edition. His original conclusion referred to Stone's (1961) earlier work.

18. He talks of the development of 'possessive individualism' as associated with the development of market relations, but notes that for the bourgeoisie it was 'the family' not 'the individual' which was the indissoluble

cell of society. (42)

19. Zaretsky (1976, 29). The timing of this division for different sectors of society is, of course, a matter of continued empirical research and debate. Some of this work, on 19th century Britain, is reviewed in the next chapter.

20. For example, Zaretsky argues that Methodism became the dominant religion of the bourgeoisie and working class since it stressed divisions between the everyday and the spiritual. Puritanism had stressed their unity.

21. Here he is drawing on the work of Secombe (1974).

22. A number of feminist authors, in addition to Hartman and Phillips are discussed in chapter 2.

23. For commentary on Foucault's concept of power see Sheridan (1980).

24. Lasch's distinctive neo-Freudian stance causes him to value the 'union of love and discipline'. For the Oedipus complex to be character-forming in any strong sense, it must be a traumatic experience. Passion must be involved. This is only possible when the father, in particular, is feared as an authority. This leads me to conclude that the family type for which he laments is closer to that regarded by Stone as an intermediate type, 'the restricted patriarchal nuclear family'. For a recent critique of Lasch see Barret and McIntosh (1982, 111-117).

25. This theme is further developed in his more recent work (Lasch, 1980). Here he talks of how 'the culture of competitive individualism, which in its decadence has carried the logic of individualism to the extreme of a war of all against all, the pursuit of happiness to the dead end of a narcissistic preoccupation with the self' (ibid, 21).

26. See note 4 for an explanation of the omission of Flandrin.

27. Here I am contradicting Sennet's (1970) reading of Aries. Sennet claims that Aries 'has the integrity to make a moral judgement about his historical materials, a judgement sharply critical of the limitations of the "nuclear" or "intensive" family on the growth of the members within it. Children growing up in such homes had greater difficulty, in Aries' view of becoming responsible, knowing actors in society than did children in the older tradition' (Sennet, 1970, 65). It is true that in the final pages of his work (Aries, 1973, 397 & 399) Aries makes a number of critical statements. However, these are not sufficiently vitriolic to suggest that the many positive evaluations of the change, throughout the book, are tongue-in-cheek, including that on page 389 quoted below.

28. Shorter (1977, 225) seems to take up Parsons' defence in the debate concerning the 'relatively isolated nuclear family'. He notes contemporary studies which have demonstrated the importance of kin to modern families (at the level of daily contact, particularly working-class families) and comments that the intensity of contact with kin bears no resemblance to the intensity of sociability in traditional times. Similarly, even in areas such as Bethnal Green (Young and Willmott, 1957), where participation in community life is high, the nuclear family represents an 'inviolable domain' (Shorter, 1977, 239-244).

29. Note that these are essentially the same as the functions Parsons attributes to the modern family, although here Stone is talking of the intermediate stage of the

restricted patriarchal nuclear family.

30. For Lasch the boundaries of the modern family have been eroded by State agents, 'the helping professions' and the media. This process has occurred since the nineteenth century when the bourgeois family approximated to a 'haven in a heartless world'. Although he describes processes similar to Donzelot, his evaluation of their consequences is different. For Donzelot the family effectively pigeonholes its members and makes them vulnerable to State intervention. In Lasch's view, the family is too desultory to be an effective container.

31. In Lasch's view the erosion of family boundaries has resulted in the draining away of emotional intensity.

32. Aries denies individualism as a prime mover of change. He argues that our modern child-centredness indicates we are not individualistic; rather it is the idea of childhood and the family which has caused the changes often attributed to individualism: 'where is the individualism in these modern lives, in which all the energy of the couple is directed to serving the best interests of posterity?' (1973, 393). Nevertheless, his account of the emergence of the modern family contains a description of a shift in emphasis from the family as a unit to the individual as a unit. This passage on page 393 simply illustrates the different definitions and difficult nature of the concept of individualism.

CHAPTER THREE

ABSTRACT ACCOUNTS AND HISTORICAL ACTUALITY

Theory, data and test cases

Few topics have been more discussed in recent years than the testing of theories against 'the facts'. The direction of the discussion has been unmistakeable: any easy confidence in the possibility of such testing has been decisively and progressively eroded.

Philosophers of the natural sciences have been in the forefront of this discussion, but their pronouncements have had wide resonances in the social sciences. First to go was the notion that 'facts' - experiment and observation - could prove theories. 'Theories are not verifiable', wrote Karl Popper (1968, 251). 'People often say of a theory that it is verified when some of the predictions derived from it have been verified'. But 'a statement can never be finally established by establishing some of its consequences' (ibid., 252). At most, Popper claimed, theories can be falsified; one experiment or observation could falsify a theory, while no finite number could verify it.

This at least allowed a weaker notion of 'corroboration': 'Instead of discussing the "probability" of a hypothesis we should try to assess what tests, what trials, it has withstood; that is, we should try to assess how far it has been able to prove its fitness to survive by standing up to tests. In brief we should try to assess how far it has been "corroborated".' (ibid., 251)

But the notion of falsification itself proved problematic. In the words of Lakatos, 'no experimental result can ever kill a theory: any theory can be saved from counterinstances either by some auxiliary hypothesis or by a suitable reinterpretation of its terms' (Lakatos, 1970, 116). What was crucial, said Lakatos, was whether the moves involved were 'progressive' (offering a 'content-increasing (scientific) explanation') or 'degenerating' (offering only a 'content-decreasing (linguistic) reinterpretation') (ibid., 118-9).

The kind of distinction, though, proved difficult to sustain in the light of the historical studies of the actual conduct of scientific investigation that were being done by people like Thomas Kuhn. It proved impossible to find an absolute point on which to stand to judge different ways of doing science as 'progressive' or 'degenerating'. While there might still be 'good' reasons (Kuhn, 1970b, 235) for choosing one theory over another, they were not compelling. The choice between paradigms - between different frameworks for doing science, embodied in different examples of 'successful' explanation - 'can never be unequivocally settled by logic and experiment alone' (Kuhn, 1970a, 93).

Of necessity, then, I cannot offer my data as any absolute test of the abstract accounts of the development of the modern family. Even complete concordance between my findings and one of the accounts would not prove the

account to be true. Nor would a discordance be an automatic falsification. Often these accounts do not offer precise predictions of the form 'in any society with feature X one will find the dominant family form to be Y; I have then had to read these predictions into them, and these readings can be challenged. Further, the meaning of social features like 'industrialisation' or features of the family such as 'child-centredness' is often far from clear. Any of the accounts can thus be saved from falsification by a 'suitable reinterpretation of its terms'. And there is always the strategy of the 'auxiliary hypothesis': some peculiarity of the history or social structure of Scotland can always be adduced in the case of divergence between theoretical prediction and empirical findings.

So it ~~would~~^y be absurd to pretend that I will be able to reach decisive conclusions about these accounts of the development of the modern family, much less about the validity of the wider paradigms (functionalism, Marxism, etc.) in which some of them are embedded. Nevertheless, I still hope that the process of discussing the fit between theory and fact will prove fruitful. The authors discussed in chapter two all clearly believe their broad-sweep accounts of the development of 'the modern family' bear some resemblance to 'real events'. Even Parsons, the author of the most abstract of these accounts, on occasion brings empirical evidence to bear. At the other extreme an author like Stone is clearly concerned to satisfy the canons of empirical inquiry in history.



Matters of empirical fact and evidence have, indeed, been central to the way in which these accounts have been assessed. Stone, for example, has been criticised for constructing a general picture of the emotional life of working people from the records left by middle-class observers (Anderson, 1980, 41).

Of course, the necessary evidence is often simply lacking. Suppose each of the broad strokes of these authors, each part of each picture of social change, every aspect of the transition from 'old' to 'new' to be found in their collective wisdom was to be put to test. An incredible wealth of empirical data would be required, a lot of which has not yet been collected and some of which may be uncollectable.

The assessment of an account of social change need not, however, involve documentary evidence from the entire period of transition. The focused examination of crucial 'test cases' can often be highly illuminating. Consider, for example, the selection of a particular population of car workers by Goldthorpe et al. (1968/9) to test the 'embourgeoisement' thesis. In this case the group most likely to be affected by the postulated change were selected. If the working class were becoming more like the middle class in outlook, then, it was argued, the geographically mobile and affluent car workers would be most affected. If we cannot then find the predicted condition in the group where it is most expected then

suspicion is cast on the theory in question.

Of course no choice of 'test case' is unchallengeable. Indeed, in the case of 'embourgeoisement', the choice of the Luton car worker was criticised by MacKenzie (1974) on precisely the grounds that it did not constitute a crucial test - there were other groups more likely to exemplify 'embourgeoisement'. Nevertheless, the examination of test cases remains a respected and useful tradition.

An example of it closer to the substantive topic of this thesis is contained in Sennet's Families against the City (Sennet, 1970). Sennet examines the family life of middle-class suburban dwellers in late 19th century Chicago. He identifies this particular group as providing a test case for the theories of Aries and Parsons. His claim is that extant documentation of the family life of this population indicate that 'the modern family' has emerged. His reading of Parsons and Aries¹ leads him to conclude that they have differing assessments of the value and worth of the modern family as a socialising agent (1970, 62): 'The change in family structure was, on his [Aries'] account, the growth of a barrier for the child to overcome as he learned to deal with the society in which he lived ... where Aries sees the specialisation of the family as a limitation on human capacities to grow, Parsons sees this specialisation as both a necessary consequence of the increasing specialisation of the whole society, and as a means of leading the child step by step into a position where he could act alone as an adult in a complex

industrial world.' (1970, 65-66)

Having created this opposition², Sennet concludes that these competing claims can be put to the test: '...each is predictive, each attempts to describe what power a pattern of historical development in the community - the emergence of private, intense family life - could have had on the chances of success or failure for the families involved. In Aries' account, the young nurtured under such circumstances should have great difficulty in the world, while in Parsons' theory they should have acquired the capacity to adapt to fragmented conditions of work and future family life in the city. As there comes to be known something more specific about the generations of young people and their parents in this urban community, it should be possible to evaluate the relative merits of these two general theories.' (Ibid, 69)

Using the 1880 Census Sennet identifies a sample of families of the newly dominant 'modern family' type and a control group of 'less-intensive', 'extended' families. The measure of success and failure used is city directories which make possible the tracing of the occupational history of father and son of this first generation of middle-class suburban residents. He concludes that the results 'tend to affirm the validity of Aries' idea against that of Parsons' (ibid, 214).

Here then the issue tested is 'the effect' of the modern family, and the test involves comparing groups in

which this family form had emerged with others in which it had not. Although I would take issue with several aspects of Sennet's work, it is a useful example of how an author has attempted to use material from a particular period to evaluate competing accounts of social change.

Growing up in Scotland and 'the modern family'

My data can, I believe, be of use in assessing accounts of the development of 'the modern family'. Firstly, Scotland is a suitable society to select in that Scottish people undoubtedly experienced the major structural shifts and the major changes in ideas referred to in the accounts of family change. Chapter four demonstrates this in detail by looking at the relevant work of economic and social historians.

Secondly the early 1900s are a suitable period because all the authors agree or imply either that 'the modern family' is present in France, Britain or the USA in the early 1900s or that the processes of family change which they describe are well under way. The causal factors effecting the development of 'the modern family' are understood by all authors to be operating by the early 1900s, and mostly well before.

The agreement between authors should not be overstated, however, and the differences on timing are important. Some accounts acknowledge that the process of transition to the modern family may not be completed by the early 1900s. For the 'sentiments school', for example, the new ideas and sentiments concerning children have not

touched all of the population. The affluence which permits the 'blossoming of maternal affection', to use Shorter's terms, may not have arrived. If these authors are correct, then the early 1900s offers the additional advantage of seeing the relevant processes well under way but still not completed.

Thirdly, my data on Scotland in the early 1900s is of a particularly focused relevance, in that it consists of the experiences of children in a particular life cycle phase in working-class and middle-class urban households, mainly in the Central Belt.

In looking for a test case of the accounts, the selection of urban households is essential. This is because the processes identified by the accounts as causing family change are typically associated with urban populations, indeed are those associated with the creation of an urban society. For example, it is often assumed that the reorganisation of paid employment associated with the pervasive development of a capitalist market economy ultimately involves concentrations of workers in larger work places in urban centres. The initial carriers of the modern family, the growing middle classes, are typically identified as an urban phenomenon. State intervention in working-class families in the name of the child is also typically regarded as an urban phenomenon. From a Marxist perspective the State concern to administer and control is particularly aroused by a concentrated urban proletariat.

The choice of ~~both~~ middle-class ~~and~~ working-class households is also necessary. In part, this is for obvious purposes of completeness. But it allows some degree of purchase on the different accounts because of the salience of the working class/middle class divide in them, and their general assumption that the processes in question affected the middle class first. Unfortunately, though, the term 'middle class' is not a precise one and there are a variety of meanings to be found between and also sometimes within accounts. As with 'the working class', empirical work also demonstrates that the reality, as well as the term, is complex. Boundaries between classes are blurred and divisions within classes discernible, as the empirical work on social class, reviewed in chapter four, shows.

These difficulties aside, the class comparison is useful. As well as predicting the presence of 'the modern family' in the middle class, a number of accounts anticipate the establishment of 'the modern family' in some or most sectors of the working class by the early 1900s. All imply the process of establishment should have begun. Thus the collective wisdom can be scrutinised by looking for the presence of 'the modern family' in 'the middle class' in the early 1900s and the beginnings of its presence in 'the working class'. The same exercise could allow for discrimination between accounts if careful attention is paid to the relative presence or absence of 'the modern family' in different sectors of each class.

Besides identifying particular class backgrounds, I

have focused on a particular stage in individual lives. It is possible to talk of both individual and family life courses. The family most dwelt on by historians and sociologists alike is the family in the stage of child rearing. The authors discussed in the previous chapter are no exception. From the point of view of the child this corresponds to the life cycle phase of 'growing-up'. Moreover, since the changing relationship between parents and children features very prominently in the accounts of the development of 'the modern family', focusing on this life cycle stage seems particularly appropriate.

Finally, the nature of my data is particularly suitable to a test case. I have interviewed men and women from working-class and middle-class urban households. The interview is of course a standard research tool of the sociologist but has only been rediscovered relatively recently by the academic historian (Thompson, 1978). The unique advantages of interviewing respondents over the traditional historians' material have been spelled out at length by Thompson, for the substantive historical area discussed here: 'Perhaps the most striking feature of all, however, is the transforming impact of oral history upon the history of the family. Without its evidence, the historian can discover very little indeed about either the ordinary family's contacts with neighbours and kin, or its internal relationships. The roles of husband and wife, the upbringing of girls and boys, the emotional and material

conflicts and dependence, the struggle of youth for independence, courtship, sexual behaviour within and outside marriage, contraception and abortion - all these were effectively secret areas. ... With the use of interviewing, it is now possible to develop a much fuller history of the family over the last ninety years, and to establish its main patterns and changes over time, and from place to place, during the life cycle and between the sexes.' (1978,7)

Thompson notes that interviewing makes it possible to ask questions of persons and on topics normally silent. Indeed, in the interview it is possible to explore and probe issues in depth. Moreover it is the researcher who decides on the questions to be asked, according to her or his interests.

I have to be cautious in my claims since I did not devise an interview schedule with the specific aim of testing accounts of the development of 'the modern family' in mind. Indeed, several of the accounts were not published at the time I was interviewing. However, I did set out to systematically collect information of a quality not available in documents. My questions about family relationships, particularly relationships between growing children and their parents, directly address the quality of relationships in the way that documents typically do not. Yet accounts of the development of 'the modern family', particularly those of the 'sentiments school', have had to generalise from less adequate sources.

Making use of the similarities and differences in accounts

Even using interviews, it would not be possible to look for 'the modern family' in these chosen households, if there was no agreement concerning its nature. Such an exercise is manageable because the authors I have discussed, disparate and competing although they are, come close to a common view of the nature of 'the modern family'. If each identified different characteristics or features of 'the modern family' as the essence of its 'modernity', then this task would be greater. As it is, the authors all identify a small number of essential characteristics of 'the modern family'. Thus it is possible, by looking in the early 1900s for evidence of each of these distinctive features of 'the modern family', to comment on the collective view concerning the timing of its emergence.

The similarities between the different authors are thus useful. It is possible to construct indicators of the characteristics they agree that 'the modern family' should have - separated-offness, emotional intensity, individualism, sex-role segregation - and then to look for such indicators in my own data. In this way I can assess the extent to which these features are present, and therefore conclude whether or not 'the modern family' is indeed there in the early 1900s. This work of constructing indicators of and searching for each characteristic feature of 'the modern family' takes place in chapters five to

eight.

The construction of indicators necessarily involves dismantling concepts, laying out their components and asking if they can be measured in any way. This is difficult and important work. It is difficult because authors do not always make clear what they mean, and sometimes apparent meaning evaporates with attempts to refine it to the point of measurability. It is important work because it is a vital, although not always explicit, stage in the process of assessing theories, constructing defensible theories and reaching justifiable conclusions when interpreting 'reality'.

Further, there are problems with the nature of the explanations the authors use. In what follows I will generally use the language of causation. But 'cause' and 'causal' are used here loosely, as the authors discussed in chapter two are far from following clear, identical and unambiguously causal explanatory patterns. Where the form of explanation is clear it is often functionalist rather than directly causal in nature, as in the case of Parsons.

Nevertheless, in almost all cases some variables are taken as primary and others as secondary and derivative. For the sake of simple exposition I refer to the former as 'causes' and to the latter as 'effects'. This causal or quasi-causal ordering can then be used as the basis for using my 'cross-sectional' data to assess developmental accounts.

The similarities between the authors make meaningful

the question 'can one describe as "modern" the families typically found in early 20th century urban Scotland?' Generally speaking, too, the accounts of each author lead, as explained above, to an expectation that the question should be answered positively. If industrialism or capitalism, or individualism create 'the modern family', then early 20th century Scotland should manifest that family form, as I argue in chapter four. If it does not do so, then accounts that suggest that it should clearly stand in some need of revision.

In that sense my data bears on all the accounts collectively. But it can perhaps also be brought to bear on them selectively. Here is where the differences between accounts are important. Some of these differences are admittedly quite difficult to make testable. Thus awarding primacy to ideational factors over structural ones, or vice versa, tends to be a deep-rooted feature of an approach rather than a detachable, testable proposition.

Nevertheless, some differences between the approaches are close enough to empirical predictions to lend themselves to some kind of assessment in the light of historical data. Different authors argue that the emergence of certain of the agreed four features of 'the modern family' - separation-off, emotional intensity, individualism and sex-role segregation - are pre-conditions, though not necessarily sufficient, for the emergence of other features. Some authors make stronger

claims than this, seeming to argue for sufficiency.

Even when the timing of the emergence of features is not discussed in detail, order of emergence is implied, since it is argued that certain features are necessary for the emergence of others. Thus the emergence of some feature, prior to some pre-condition, according to some account, is anomalous for that account. The pattern of presence and absence of particular features of 'the modern family' in the early 1900s may allow some discrimination between competing accounts.

For example, the majority of authors argue that 'separated-offness' of the family is prior to 'emotional intensity'. This is particularly clear in the case of authors who emphasise the role of structural change in shaping the family. For some authors, structural change - the separation of 'home' and 'work', the establishing of 'the family' as an autonomous residential unit, the separation of men and women - generates the experience of the family as 'separated-off'. The development of 'emotional intensity' to an unprecedented degree is conditional on this 'separation-off'. For these authors, the widespread existence of families which are 'emotionally intense' but not 'separated-off' from the wider social world and sex segregated would be intensely anomalous, since a feature emerges in the absence of some necessary precondition.

Zaretsky and Donzelot are good examples of authors

whose work suggests particular patterns of features that ought, and ought not, to exhibit dependency. For Zaretsky, it is the reorganisation of production associated with industrial capitalism which first created the major structural shifts: the separation of 'home' and 'work', private and public, reproduction and production and the creation of surplus production on a scale which fostered a rise in the living standards of the majority. These structural separations were experienced as a heightened contrast between home and the public sphere, particularly 'work'. In his account, then, these structural shifts are a necessary precondition for the seeking of personal fulfilment at home, which subsumed an increase in the 'emotional intensity' of relationships and an emphasis on 'individual' happiness. Two of the characteristics of 'the modern family', 'separated-oneness' and 'sex role segregation', are aspects of structural change and are thus prior to 'emotional intensity' and an emphasis on 'the individual'.

Similarly with Donzelot, who also awards primacy to the structural. But his account suggests another possible area of empirical assessment, for his 'prime mover' is more easily identifiable historically than Zaretsky's rather pervasive 'capitalism'. In Donzelot's work, the major structural shift which affects the family is the development of the State, State-sanctioned professions and institutionalised means of administering the population. For Donzelot, 'the modern family' is subtly imposed on the

working class through the institutionalised means of administering the population. The fostering of a 'separated-off', 'sex-segregated' family of 'individual' citizens by State-sanctioned bodies is to be seen in the context of a general development in techniques of control. For Donzelot the role of the State in the shaping of the family occurs via various routes but there is a particular concentration of intervention passing through the child. Much interference in the family is in the name of the 'individual' child. The 'separation-off' of women and children is part of a process of creating administrable units and the 'emotional intensity', which Donzelot sees in almost Laingian³ terms, follows. So if 'separation-off' and 'emotional intensity' are found prior to large-scale State interventions, Donzelot's schema becomes questionable.

If Parsons is read as saying that the family is shaped to 'fit' the occupational sphere, then his work, too, implies the same sequencing of features in which the structural precedes the more ideational. But here we do have to be cautious, for, in Parsons' more abstract formulations of social change, structural change and ideational change are inextricably linked with no sequence. Here is precisely the kind of ambiguity that makes testing difficult.

The tendency to see 'emotional intensity' as contingent on structural factors is shared by some authors emphasising

the role of ideas. Thus Aries feels that the withering away of the mediaeval web of sociability was needed before emotional relationships between members of the family could progress beyond their 17th century intermediate stage of intensity. This is very similar to Parsons' view of 'emotional intensity' increasing as the family becomes relatively isolated.

However, for Aries it is ideas which provoke the structural shifts. Structural change is more consequence than cause of ideational change. This has implications for his perception of the relationship between features of 'the modern family'. The structural change which Aries discusses at greatest length is the institutionalised separation of children and adults. This structural change is a consequence of a shift in ideas about children. The 'separated-offness' of the family and the increased 'emotional intensity' of parent-child relationships are similarly a consequence of a new awareness and conscience concerning children. For Aries, and also Shorter, the concern for children is what provoked their 'separation-off' in the home, and their inclusion in the category 'women and children'. Thus the 'separated-off' family should not be present without its 'cause'- concern for children.

For Shorter, concern for and feeling for children cannot be separated. He believes that mothers who are able to act on their concern will 'naturally' have 'emotionally intense' relationships with their children, withdrawing

from the world into a 'separated-off' family to do so. For Aries, concern for 'the child' typically fosters 'emotionally intense' relationships, but the 'separation-off' of the family (which is done in the name of the child) is a necessary intervening variable.

The emphasis on 'the individual' is, for Aries, also a consequence of the emphasis on the child. So some handle on the empirical validity of Aries' account can be gained if we ascertain the extent to which a separate sphere of childhood precedes more derivative features such as 'emotional intensity', or an emphasis on 'the individual'.

Stone and Goode emphasise the role of a system of ideas rooted in Protestantism which they refer to respectively as 'affective individualism' and 'individualistic philosophy'. Goode notes the power of 'individualistic philosophy' to undermine patriarchal authority and foster emotionally close relationships. In his account neither structural nor ideational change is unequivocally the prime mover, but his work suggests an interesting and possibly testable interaction between causal sequence and class location. The working-class family became nuclear and 'separated-off' as a consequence of structural change before ideational change undermined patriarchy. The well-to-do family retained an organisational form with more widely distributed roots while being more influenced by ideational shifts.

Stone also sees the 'separated-offness' of the family

and 'sex-role segregation' as prior to 'emotional intensity' and an emphasis on 'the individual'. For Stone, Protestant moral theology is the most significant factor in encouraging the 'separation-off' of the family and 'sex-role segregation'. The family system fostered by Protestantism was patriarchal. Fathers were gravely concerned with the upbringing of their children but distant and authoritarian. At this intermediate stage, the restricted patriarchal nuclear family, the family is 'separated-off' and 'sex-role segregated' but not 'emotionally intense' or 'individualistic'. 'Affective individualism' subsequently (by undermining patriarchy) reduced the emotional distance between family members while shifting greater emphasis on 'the individual'. For Stone (and also for Goode) the dominance of an 'emotionally intense' family situation in which there is no emphasis on 'the individual' would thus be a total puzzle.

Cross-sectional data like mine ~~can~~ thus be brought to bear on developmental accounts such as those I am considering here, both in terms of their explicit or implicit chronologies, and also in terms of the patterns of presence or absence of variables that are implied by their causal orderings. But it is perhaps appropriate to conclude this chapter by reminding the reader of the grave difficulties that stand in the way of turning this process into a formal test of these accounts. The ambiguities of the accounts, the unclear meanings of their crucial variables, the lack of empirical and chronological

specifications ... all these combine to make clear assessment difficult, even aside from the philosophical problems alluded to at the start of this chapter.

My aim in what follows is thus modest. Aside from simply presenting my data - which is, I hope, of interest purely in its own right as oral history of primary relations in Scotland - I will examine the extent to which it can be used to assess these overall accounts. The reader should not expect hard-and-fast conclusions. But I hope that the enterprise will be of interest, not only in what it reveals about the early 20th century Scottish family, but in what it reveals about accounts of the development of 'the modern family' and how these need to be elaborated in conjunction with empirical history.

Before I turn to my data on the Scottish family, however, there is one further necessary preliminary. We need to examine the nature of Scottish society in general at the turn of the 20th century, and in particular to check whether it was indeed the kind of society that our various authors see as fostering 'modernity' in family form.

1. I have already stated that I strongly disagree with Sennet's reading of Aries (see footnote 27, chapter two). This does not, in any way, detract from the usefulness of Sennet's work as an example of the use of a test case.
2. Since I do not accept that Aries evaluates the family's socialising role in quite this way, this is not an opposition I accept.
3. Laing and his associates discuss the psychologically stultifying and crippling aspects of emotionally intense parent/child relationships (Laing, 1971; Cooper, 1972) 'To Laing the family is, among other things, an institution where "normal parents" get their children to love them by terrorizing them.' (Morgan, 1975, 115)

CHAPTER FOUR

SCOTTISH SOCIETY, STRUCTURAL CHANGE AND THE FAMILY

Introduction

Analysts of social change often regard the family as a dependent variable, as an entity which is shaped by other changes rather than an active source of change.¹ In this view the family is regarded as an area of 'choice', but it is simultaneously acknowledged that such choices are both restricted by external constraints and of little consequence for the world outwith the family. Constraints in this sense simply mean limits to necessary resources. Thus the choices individuals make about having sex, marrying, bringing up children, are seen as both constrained by and, despite Malthus, of little consequence for the labour market, for example; while the means of gaining a livelihood, which the labour market provides, is understood as a crucial component of necessary resources.

Social scientists, of course, recognise that individuals' choices can be shaped in other ways than by external constraints. Our ideas about what we wish to do are not straightforwardly our own ideas. Socially constructed norms and values typically indicate the 'right' choice to individuals. But because these norms and values are as important as external constraints, and because they are inculcated at least in part within the family, recognition of their importance reduces the opposition between the constraining outside world and an arena of choice in the family. Indeed, some authors reverse the

view of the family as a dependent variable as follows: by modifying the sense of 'right' given to a new generation, the family has an impact on all aspects of society.

The authors introduced in chapter two differ in the extent to which they emphasise the family as dependent or independent variable. The difference corresponds at least roughly to whether an author emphasises changes in external constraints or changes in ways of thinking as fostering the emergence of 'the modern family'. This difference I have referred to above as the difference between those who emphasise structural change and those who emphasise the role of ideas. For structure implies constraint. It is 'society' on a scale and at a level sufficiently removed from the individual to be experienced as constraint, as limits to resources, which are not open to re-negotiation and often elude comprehension. Structural change thus implies changing constraints: some resources become more plentiful, but new bounds and new compulsions simultaneously appear.

The primary task of this chapter is to demonstrate that the major structural changes identified by the authors in chapter two had taken place in Scotland by the early 1900s. The major causes of 'the modern family', in their terms, I shall show, were indeed already in existence at the point to which my data relate. I shall also discuss evidence from existing secondary literature on such topics as the separation of 'family' and 'work', the divide

between adults and children, and the growth of State intervention in the family - all fields that some at least of the authors reviewed in chapter two regard as crucial.

A secondary task is to establish whether all my respondents inhabited the same 'historical time'. Roughly half the respondents were born in or before 1900 and roughly half in the decade 1901-1910 (see table four, Appendix two). Thus some were 'grown up' by the First World War and others were at school during the War. The First World War is often regarded as a watershed. It is, therefore, important to consider whether the 'older' and 'younger' respondents inhabited the same world.

Industrialisation

At the most general level, the structural changes the authors refer to could be summarised as the development of a capitalist industrial economy.² Aspects of this development have occupied countless books and papers. Here my discussion is extremely brief. It is not particularly useful to dwell on such a general change. It is specific aspects of this transition which are identified as more or less directly impacting on the family. However, some general discussion is necessary background to these more specific aspects.

Both the general discussion of the development of industrial capitalism and the discussion of the specific aspects which follows are focused on structural change. They do not, however, wholly neglect changes in ideas. Those authors who stress the role of ideas in social change

see them as affecting structural change. For other authors, ideas adapt to structural change. Whichever way the causal arrows point, the two are seen as bound together. Detailed empirical work on any aspect of industrialisation (for example the separation of home and work) inevitably asks questions about the ideas of actors as well as attempting to document their actions.

In all that follows, since exclusively Scottish material is rather sparse, it is convenient to draw as well on the larger body of work on England. It is generally accepted that the 'take-off' in industrialisation in Scotland and in England were simultaneous, sharing a common set of causes (Smout, 1972, 224). And more recent work on modern Scottish social structure suggests remarkably close parallelism, both in present structure and in historical trajectory, between Scotland and England (Kendrick, 1983).

The most intense period of British industrialisation is conventionally dated as late 18th to mid-19th century. The minimal meaning of 'industrialisation' is an increase in the proportion of the workforce engaged in 'industry' - that is in manufacture or, more loosely, in production processes other than agriculture. But the 'take-off' in industrialisation, the Industrial Revolution, is a shorthand for much more: a change in the pace of technological innovation, a sharp increase in production capacity and national income, larger workforces subjected to new techniques of management, a concentration of

employment in urban centres.

All this and more are indicated by the suitably vaguer terms 'modernisation' and 'development', often used interchangeably with 'industrialisation'. Correlates of 'industrialisation' in this sense are changing class structures, urbanisation, demographic transition from high to low fertility and mortality, and a general rise in the standard of living to relative affluence. These I shall examine below, but first it is necessary to say a little more about the basic concept of 'industrialisation'.

The Unevenness of Industrialisation

In neither Scotland nor England was industrialisation a simple matter of linear evolution. It was, rather, an uneven process along several different dimensions.

Levitt and Smout (1979) comment on the industrial capacity of Scotland in the mid-19th century. The industry of Scotland was then, as now, concentrated in the Central Belt, although spread more widely than now within that region. While towns had been growing rapidly since the start of the 19th century, much industry was still rural. Machines had not yet superseded hand work in some industries, and many machines were still water powered. The rise in scale of production, the technical changes, the changes in the organisation of the labour process, continued at an uneven pace in different industries into the 20th century. Samuel's investigation of the labour process in many 19th century occupations suggests that factory-based steam-powered machinery was not the dominant

form of 'industrial' production. His main argument is that hand tools and sheer toil were as important as steam-powered machinery in the so-called industrial revolution. His work exposes the weakness of the notion that the factory system inexorably spread at the expense of other forms of production. In some trades the use of factory-based machines was associated with new types of home-based work. Samuel notes, for example, that in the Nottingham lace trade of the 1860s there were more outworkers, mending and making-up, than factory employees. (Samuel, 1977, 47) Smout makes similar observations concerning the Paisley shawl industry (Smout, 1972, 237 & 368). The abundance and cheapness of labour combined with technical difficulties to encourage developments in production other than the increased use of factory-based machinery.

Thus large proportions of the workforce engaged in industrial work did so in contexts other than large workforces, outwith factories, using more primitive equipment than powered machines. This is not to say that all the features of the work situation which we associate with 'industrialisation' were absent. For example, the work of Snell (1981) has demonstrated that even in agriculture changes were occurring in the labour process which have often been associated with 'industrialisation'. Tasks were becoming increasingly specific and work more regimented. But as a description of the majority experience 'industrial' is a misnomer for another reason.

The growth in jobs in manufacture was matched and eventually outpaced by a growth in jobs in the service sector (Kumar, 1978, 200-204).

'Industrialisation', then, must now be read as a shorthand for a whole complex of changes in where and how people earned their living, which is not adequately summarised as an exodus from the land and cottage industry to the factory.

Industrialisation and Class Structure

A major correlate of industrialisation is a changing class structure. The classic understanding of this is Marx's. Capitalist industrialisation would sweep away the remnants of previous forms of social stratification, polarising society into a class of capitalists, owners of the means of production, and a propertyless proletariat of wage labourers. 'In proportion as the bourgeoisie, i.e., capital, is developed, in the same proportion is the proletariat, the modern working class, developed - a class of labourers, who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labour increases capital. These labourers, who must sell themselves piecemeal, are a commodity, like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market.' (Jordan, 1971, 153)

That model has long been recognised by both Marxists and non-Marxists as too simple an account of the impact of industrialisation on class structure. Non-Marxists have

argued that industrialisation does not sweep away, even though it may transform, forms of stratification based on status. Marxists have continued to hold relationship to the means of production as primary, but have accepted that relations to the means of production are more complex than the simple bipolar model of the **Communist Manifesto**.³

As industrialisation proceeded, the middle class grew. 'Those who lived in towns and lived by employing their brains and their capital' (Smout, 1972, 339) expanded in numbers, in status and in economic and political power.

'One thing, nevertheless, which almost all groups in the middle class shared was the dizzy sense of opportunity which pervaded the towns from 1760 onwards. Lawyers prospered when farmers and landowners flourished ... Merchants grew wealthy with the opening of new trades ... Businessmen multiplied in old occupations, and appeared in many new ones that had not existed a century before - as bankers, as owners of cotton factories and chemical works, of ironworks, sugar refineries, distilleries, papermills, glassworks and powdermills. ... All this created a second wave of benefits to those professions that attended to the needs of middle class and landed class alike. Doctors and ministers, for instance, found their income rising.' (Smout, 1972, 340)

The 19th century saw further expansion of the middle class, consolidation of their gains and of internal divisions within the class. In the late 18th and early

19th century, businessmen and merchants were often recruited from families of wealthy landowners, the landed class or aristocracy. It was not uncommon to move into business and then back to the land. As the 19th century progressed, businesses became larger and withdrawal of capital less possible, and this practice declined (Smout, 1972, 338; Perkin, 1972, 431). By 1900 capitalists (financiers in particular) outnumbered landowners in the ranks of the fabulously wealthy (Rubinstein, 1977, especially 102).

The middle class is seldom treated as a monolithic entity by historians. Both Perkin and Smout, for example, recognise 'the professions' as a separate strand from those with commercial and business interests, the capitalist middle class. For Perkin these two groupings differ not only in their source of income but in their outlook on life, their image of society. 'The ideal citizen for the bulk of the middle class was, naturally, the capitalist, and the ideal society a class society based on capital and competition.' (Perkin, 1972, 221) The professional outlook, on the other hand, includes a potential critique of the capitalist.

'Their [the professionals'] ideal society was a functional one based on expertise and selection by merit. For them trained and qualified expertise rather than property, capital or labour, should be the chief determinant and justification of status and power in society.' (Perkin, *ibid*, 258)⁴ The latter half of the 19th

century saw a marked increase in the number of professionals and an increase in their proportion of the middle class as a whole (Perkin, *ibid*, 429).

Professionals are not the only constituents of the middle class who have been identified by historians as a distinctive social entity. Crossick (1977) writes of the emergence of the lower middle class. Gray (1977) prefers to use the term 'middle strata' because of the heterogeneity of even this category. For him the 'lower middle class' is composed of two occupational groupings, small business proprietors, on the one hand, and white collar employees, civil servants, local government officers and clerks of all descriptions, on the other.

The late 19th and early 20th century was a period of expansion in the ranks of these white collar workers. At the same time the environment was felt to be increasingly unfavourable to small business proprietors. Small businessmen felt squeezed by the concentration of capital, the advance of large-scale production and the rise of cartels and monopolies, while small retailers were similarly affected by the spread of department stores and multiple shops (Crossick, 15&16). Indeed, Perkin goes so far as to suggest that, from the middle of the 19th century, the business middle class as a whole was being replaced by 'a new and rather different class of big corporate business men, the harbingers of the new plutocracy of the late Victorian and Edwardian England.'

(1972, 409) (The distribution of occupations within the middle class is given for 1911 in table eight, Appendix one)

This recognition of distinct and changing social groups within the middle class has been paralleled by the identification of divisions within the working class. The most discussed category of the Victorian and Edwardian working class is the 'labour aristocracy'.⁵ Hobsbawm (1968) describes this grouping as the 'distinctive upper strata of the working class, better paid, better treated and generally regarded as more "respectable" and politically moderate than the mass of the proletariat.' Gray (1976, 1977) argues that despite their relative affluence this group retained an outlook distinct from that of the lower middle class. They had taken to heart aspects of middle-class individualism, the value of self-help, for example. But, Gray claims, their continued commitment to cooperation separated them from the unambiguously individualistic outlook of the bourgeoisie.

Some historians have also identified a distinctive grouping at the bottom of the heap, those in greatest poverty, those for whom existence was most acutely precarious. They form a social grouping rather than simply an analyst's category in so far as they had a distinctive outlook on life and were treated as distinctive by the remainder of the working class. Certainly, contemporaries were acutely conscious of a 'residuum' in the big cities, and of the distinction between 'rough' and 'respectable'

working class.⁶ However, although the idea of 'rough families' has remained salient among the working class for generations, there is no clear evidence of a distinct self-perpetuating social group.⁷

Urbanisation

Levitt and Smout (1979, 6) note that urbanisation was far from present day levels in the mid-19th century: 'The historian is accustomed to thinking of Scotland as an industrialising and urbanising country from 1780 onwards, which is, of course, perfectly correct. The 1841 census shows, however, that even after sixty years of this process Scotland was still by modern standards very imperfectly urbanised. Only 35% of the population lived in towns of 5000 inhabitants or more, compared with 74% in 1971.'

But by 1911 the Census indicates that the population distribution was close to that of the present day. 30% of the Scottish population lived in the four cities, Glasgow, Edinburgh, Dundee and Aberdeen. Over 50% of the population lived in towns of more than 10,000. The largest Scottish town of Glasgow was approaching a population of 800,000 by 1911.

Urbanisation was a very different process for people in different classes. By the late nineteenth century, middle-class and working-class families lived in different parts of the towns in very different houses. While the middle class had several apartments, the urban working-class majority typically lived in one or two rooms. The

1901 Census indicates that 58% of Scottish families were living in dwellings of no more than two rooms. In 1911 62% of Glasgow's population lived in such dwellings.⁸ Middle-class households had their own piped water and water closet, whereas in many working-class tenements several families shared a sink and privy.

Working-class housing in Scotland remained notorious well into the 20th century. Problems of overcrowding and high rents were exacerbated in some areas during the First World War. Only with the beginning of large scale State provision of housing in the inter-war period were conditions somewhat alleviated (Melling, 1980; Gauldie 1976).

Demographic Transition

Britain experienced rapid population growth from about 1780 to 1870. The causes of the 18th century population growth have been a matter of prolonged debate. There is now considerable evidence that a rise in fertility was primarily responsible with a fall in mortality being of secondary importance (Wrigley & Schofield, 1981; Levine, 1977).⁹

In the last decades of the 19th century the rate of population growth slowed considerably and then fell dramatically between 1911 and 1939. Throughout this period mortality and fertility rates fell. (For tables documenting the fall in fertility and mortality and trends in marriage see tables one to six, Appendix one)

Infant mortality, however, remained high, particularly in poorer urban districts, into the 20th century. An indirect relationship between infant mortality and fertility, sometimes referred to as 'the child survival hypothesis', is often postulated. It is suggested that parents are likely to have fewer children if they are secure in the knowledge that these few will survive, and so a decrease in infant and child mortality changes the attitude of parents to having children. This hypothesis, however, implies 'a rather complicated kind of foresight' and has been found increasingly wanting by recent researchers (Banks, 1981, 120-123).

For most sectors of the population, the death rate for those aged between five and 44 had declined during the 19th century, but infant mortality did not decline steadily till the 20th century (Gittins, 1982, 35). Class differences in mortality were marked and persistent. In 1911, for example, children of fathers in Registrar-General's class V were twice as likely to die before they were a year old than those in class 1 (Banks, 1981, 123).

A secular decline in fertility began in Britain in the second half of the 19th century. The causes of the decline, including the details of variation by class are still a matter of some debate (Woods, 1982, 112-130). Gittins gives this account: 'While the national birth rate did not begin to decline until the 1860s, fertility varied greatly by class, and among the upper classes had started to decline much earlier. In the latter part of the 19th

century fertility contracted considerably among the middle classes. The largest families occurred among miners and agricultural labourers, although the family size of textile workers had been low for much of the nineteenth century...' (Gittins, 1982, 36). The 1911 Census of Scotland provides a table showing the average number of children per marriage by occupation.¹⁰ The averages range from 7.0 for the plasterer's labourer to 3.8 for the army officer.¹¹ Middle-class occupations, particularly professionals and clerks, tend to cluster at the low end of the scale. Several skilled working-class occupations: joiners, plumbers, fitters and turners have averages around 5.5 and 5.6. The unskilled general labourer and the scavenger have averages of 6.2 and 6.3.

Despite the persistence of a range of family sizes within classes the early 1900s is characterised as a period of declining class differences: 'By the twentieth century, while differentials still remained between social classes and occupational groups, they had been substantially reduced as the result of rapid contraction of family size among most sectors of the working class.' (Gittins, *ibid*, 36)

Affluence

Industrialisation was associated with a rise in national income and a proliferation in the variety of goods and services available for purchase. The increased income was not always shared around equally, however, and

population growth meant that per capita incomes rose much more slowly than aggregate income. Perkin (1972, 143-147, 414-423) suggests that rises in wages experienced by the working class to the mid-19th century did not keep pace with the rise in national income. But Bowley (1920) and Routh (1965) suggest that the working-class share of national income remained stable in the late 19th and early 20th century. In a context of economic growth, this meant undeniable increases in standard of living for the majority.

Nevertheless, large sectors of the working class could not even by 1900 be called affluent, except perhaps relative to some carefully selected wretchedness of a century previous. Perkin notes the findings of Booth's and Rowntree's surveys of poverty 'Not until Booth in the 1880s and Rowntree in 1899 do we have reliable estimates of the numbers in poverty, that is, with too little income to maintain themselves in merely physical health. By that time, at the end of a century and more of steeply rising national income, thirty-one and twenty-eight per cent respectively of the population of London and York, forty and forty-three per cent of the working class, were below the poverty line. Clearly, this huge segment of the working class had not yet benefitted from industrialism, except in the crude sense that greater numbers of them had been kept alive to suffer the same life of misery and frustration. Their release from the frozen grip of poverty had to wait for the twentieth century with its

disproportionate rise of unskilled wages and of the Welfare State.' (Perkin, 1972, 146-147)

Most authors recognise the particular difficulties of trying to generalise about 'the working class' with reference to income. There were incredible fluctuations in the fates of different occupational groupings as well as the systematic advantage of 'the labour aristocracy' over the rest. Burgess (1980), however, does conclude that the differences between working-class groups were diminishing in the late 19th century and early 20th century. This process involved not only economic levelling but ideological changes, and changes in the organisation of production that placed less of a premium on 'skill': 'The economic pressures affecting the working class during the period 1906-14 produced a greater awareness of common interest among wage-earners who had previously been much more comprehensively divided by differences in skill, earning, status and patterns of residence and association. ... [These changes were] the effects of changes in the labour process narrowing the scope for multifunctional expertise, which became the prerogative of a diminishing proportion of even skilled workers.' (Burgess, 1980, 116)

The First World War was a period of inflation, steeply rising prices and rising wages. Marwick (1973, 126) sums up the situation for working-class families as follows: 'It was clear that it was only through the working of longer and more regular hours by more of its members that the

ordinary family managed to keep a seat on the unbroken bronco of price inflation.' Families with an unfavourable ratio of dependants to earners, therefore, were likely to experience a worsening of their situation during the war years (Marwick, 1975, 126). But some sectors of the working class, as a result of trade union activity, did experience real rises in income during the period.

The middle-class experience of price inflation during the war years was also varied. Some businesses made considerable profits because of the war, including many small businesses. Growing government departments offered new opportunities for civil service careers. But those whose salaries remained fixed experienced a decline in income in real terms. Moreover, the rate of income tax increased sharply during the war. A middle-class reader of the Daily Mail (quoted in Marwick, 1975, 128) complained in October 1915 of the hardship - with income tax taking fully 25 pounds of a 400 pound income!

The war, and the new employment it provided for women, is often blamed for increased difficulty in keeping domestic servants. The decline in the number of servants pre-dates the war, was not markedly exacerbated by it and was stemmed by the Depression (table seven, Appendix one).

The early inter-war years

The First World War is sometimes presumed to be a watershed, dividing, for example, the age of the horse from that of the car and the age of crystallised class differences from increased affluence for all. The First

World War was not, however, always the crucial turning point which lead to post-war change, and change was considerably less rapid and dramatic than the image of a watershed suggests.

Like the gradual decline of domestic service, many secular trends were not seriously influenced by the First World War. The War did not disrupt overall trends of increase in life-expectancy and decrease in fertility. But rather than a picture of accelerated change, the Depression temporarily stemmed or even reversed some trends. Some demographic features of the present, like relatively young marriage remained absent in the early post war years (Anderson, 1983, and see tables four to six, Appendix one). There were particular improvements in infant mortality in the first three decades of the 20th century, but high rates of infant deaths remained a feature of the poorer urban districts. Indeed, class differences persisted, as before, in fertility, in mortality, in morbidity, in income, in wealth, in housing and in education. The narrowing of the gap between working class and middle class had begun in some cases, family size for example, but was far from complete. In others, like the standard of housing, improvements had hardly begun for the bulk of the working class. Class differences were not radically reduced but the extremes were less visibly spectacular: the wealthy, for example, were less able to maintain country houses and a somewhat reduced proportion of the population were in

abject poverty (Stevenson, 1977; Mowat, 1968).

Throughout the inter-war years the proportion of the employed population engaged in agriculture, forestry and fishing continued to decline while that of those engaged in service industries increased. The stability of the proportion engaged in manufacturing was disrupted by the depression and there were, of course, also some very real changes within manufacturing, affecting the employment opportunities available. The slump in 'traditional' heavy industries of the '20s and '30s was accompanied by the growth of new industries and areas of prosperity.

The war years themselves were in many senses remarkable and thus invited a sense of contrast. The near full employment of the war, for example, sharpened the contrast with the '20s and '30s. But just as the steeply rising prices of the war had balanced increased household incomes, so the falling prices of the '20s and '30s, along with meagre State benefits, helped families survive unemployment. Falling prices meant those who had a stable income throughout the period experienced a rise in the standard of living.

In spite of mass unemployment there was a rise in 'average living standards' between 1918 and 1939 (Stevenson, 1977, 21). This conclusion is based on statistical rather than experiential evidence. Wage rates and actual wages were relatively stable (many wages, in both working-class and middle-class occupations, were cut in the worst years of the depression) and since prices fell

'... this meant that average real incomes generally rose in the years between the wars, even in the depressed thirties, by about 18 per cent.' (Ibid, 23)

However, the thesis of a general creeping increase in 'affluence' in the '20s and '30s is given some support by studies of poverty. Bowley and Hogg, for example, surveyed the same towns in 1912-14 and 1923-24 (Stevenson, *ibid*, 95) and found a decrease in families in poverty, which they attributed to falling family size and improved wages. Unemployment was replacing the death of the principal earner as the major cause of poverty. In the 'worst' town studied, Reading, in 1912-14 almost 1 in 2 (46%) children under 14 years old lived in households where 'the normal means of living were insufficient' (*ibid*, 83) by 1923-24 this was reduced to 1 in 7. This change is neither negligible nor indicative of a rapid rush into affluence for all.

Little of the consumerism that, observers like Orwell claimed, lightened working-class lives was an immediate post-war phenomenon. Several 'modern' forms of leisure pre-dated the war: cinemas and dance halls, for example. Many made little impact until after 1930. Transformations in the comfort of working-class households were not rapid in the early inter-war period: gas cookers and electric lighting were not standard equipment. While experimental wireless broadcasting began in 1920, the British Broadcasting Corporation did not begin to transmit

programmes until the end of 1922, and it was some time before access to radios became common (Mowat, 1968, 241-244). The 'wireless' was thus not a childhood experience of even the youngest of my respondents.

It is true that between 1918 and 1930 the motorised vehicle was steadily, even rapidly, replacing the horse-drawn one and increasing numbers of middle-class households owned a car. But again the change should not be overstated. By 1930, the majority of the population had still never been in a petrol driven vehicle. The lag between the ability of the better-off to afford the latest convenience and its accessibility to the rest of the population remained considerable.

I would argue, then, that it is inappropriate to regard the First World War as a watershed. The class structure, with its division within and between classes, remained fundamentally the same, many trends pre-dated 1914 and changes which occurred in the years 1918 to 1930 were often creeping rather than dramatic. Much of the experience of everyday life was unaltered.

The separation of family and 'work'

I now wish to step back again to surveying not just the first decades of the 20th century but also the 19th century background to these years. In this and the next section I look in more depth at structural changes regarded by one or more authors as having a particular impact on the family.

The separation of work and family is conventionally

associated with the process of 'industrialisation'. Tilly and Scott, writing about France and Britain, offer the following widely accepted description of industrialisation: 'The scale of production increased and the factory replaced the household as the center of productive activity. In the terms we have been using, the industrial mode of production replaced the domestic mode of production. The process of industrialisation was gradual, and it affected different groups of people at different times. Over the long run, the decline of small units of production meant a decline in the numbers of propertied peasants and craftsmen and an increase in proletarians, propertyless people working for wages. The family wage economy, which had characterised the family organisation of propertyless people in the past, became an increasingly common form of family organization among the working classes.' (Tilly and Scott, 1978, 63)

Here several simultaneous changes are referred to - the separation of place of work from home, the separation of production from consumption and reproduction, the increased reliance of the family on wages. These linked changes - and their relation to the development of sex-segregated family roles - are crucial to contemporary discussion of the development of the family. But a few caveats are in order before we accept this picture wholesale.

Thus, some occupations have involved the separation of 'home' and 'work' for centuries, stone masons and

agricultural labourers being good examples. While it is true that with industrialisation, however, this separation did become increasingly dominant, it did not do so universally or evenly. Smout's example of the Paisley shawl industry, and Samuel's of lace making, have already indicated this. Factory work was often supplemented by large - even increasing - numbers of working-class women home workers.

The separation of home and work for the middle class in Britain was also gradual and uneven: 'Clergymen for example, have never quite lived in their workplaces though they have often lived next door to them. Doctors and dentists, on the other hand ... were still likely in the twentieth century to combine home and workplace. Large-scale manufacturers often lived next door to their factories so that they could easily oversee them ... For those small manufacturers who relied on workshop production, it was most convenient to combine home and workplace and many merchants had their warehouses at the back of living quarters. Technological advances which revolutionised the labour process rarely forced those in middle-class occupations to establish a home away from work.' (Hall, 1982a, 4) She does conclude, though, that 'by the mid-nineteenth century this separation [of 'home' and 'work'] was becoming increasingly popular.' (Ibid.) This is evidenced by the expansion in lock-up shops in town centres (Alexander, 1970) and the development of suburbs in which leasing arrangements prohibited the setting up of workshops

or shops (Davidoff and Hall, 1983).

While the image of a growing separation of 'home' and 'work' is thus not altogether misleading (even if the reality is quite complex), it would be quite wrong to see that separation as leading in any automatic way to a separation of 'family' and 'work' or to the exclusion of women and children from the work place. Thus writers on the British cotton industry from Smelser (1959) onwards,¹² have noted that the factory system did not completely separate family and work. For example, the male spinners of the cotton mills sometimes hired their own relatives as piecers and scavengers. Humphries (1981) and John (1980) have shown a similar pattern of recruitment in mining. Male hewers hired their own carriers and when possible employed their own sisters and daughters until legislation restricting the employment of women and children disrupted this pattern.

It is often taken for granted in reference to the separation of home and 'work' that this separation on its own can explain the relative absence of women and children from 'work'. But the explanation of that relative absence is of necessity more complex than this. Indeed, the very terms of the discussion concerning the separation of family and 'work' are challenged by authors researching and re-evaluating the history of women's work. Questions are raised, in particular, when discussing working-class women. 'Working' or 'labour force participation' have come to mean

activity conducted for financial reward away from place of residence and relaxation. This does not allow for unpaid domestic labour to be recognised as work. Nor does the association of home and non-work, or leisure, fit for several categories of remunerated work typically performed by women.

Davidoff puts her finger on one key problem when she notes that 'the conceptual limitations of this division between the labour market and the home are clear when trying to analyse a situation such as residential domestic service: the largest single occupation for women ...' (Davidoff, 1979, 66) Nor can this difficulty be remedied by talking about the separation of family and paid work. The landlady and lodger relationship and the confusion of the creators of the census regarding 'the contradictions in dealing with domestic activities' (Davidoff, 1979, 67) demonstrate this.

Davidoff emphasises that definitions of what constitutes men's and women's work were shaped in struggle and not merely by structural change: 'Particularly in the period 1780 to 1850, the definition of masculinity and femininity, together with their social location in work and home, became an arena of conflict. The process of redefinition was taking place throughout the society, although it was interpreted in different ways by different class groups.'

But the boundaries and nature of this 'arena of conflict' are not uncontroversial. The extent to which

women, particularly married women, were actively excluded from paid work remains disputed, as does who excluded them and why.

Working-class women have always contributed to the household economy of their own or parents' family. In the case of young single women this has often involved work away from their own household (albeit often joining the household of another). The jobs young women performed in 19th century Britain were typically jobs held almost exclusively by women. Working class married women adopted a variety of strategies for contribution to the domestic economy including taking paid work outwith the home (Scott & Tilly 1975, Tilly & Scott 1978).

As the 20th century approached, the proportion of married women working outside the home seems to have declined. But at least part of this decline may be an artifact of the changing procedures of census enumerators.¹³ And the explanation of any real decline is problematic. Tilly and Scott (1978) suggest that 'married women's childbearing and domestic responsibilities became more demanding and more time consuming while the time they spent in wage earning activities diminished.' Given that employment opportunities were largely restricted to poorly paid, toilsome occupations, married women were increasingly 'choosing' not to work, they suggest. This choice was encouraged, though, by a decrease in employment opportunities for married women, and facilitated by a

reduction in economic necessity with improvements in wages and health of their men.

Tilly and Scott thus characterise the relative absence of employed married women in the early 20th century as a rational choice given the circumstances. For some authors, however, it is precisely these 'circumstances' which are the issue. Tilly and Scott say little of the process by which opportunities for employment for men and women were differentiated and a gender based dual labour market (Barron and Norris, 1976) created. It is not simply that, in the words of Philips and Taylor (1980, 79): 'Far from being an objective economic fact, skill is often an ideological category imposed on certain types of work by virtue of the sex and power of the workers who perform it'. Cynthia Cockburn argues that even the 'real' elements in skill - physical effectiveness, competence with technology, and so on - were actively captured by men. Her work on the printing industry (Cockburn, 1981) shows how male compositors sought - even at the cost of themselves doing repetitive, laborious and menial work - to exclude women from their place of work. They consistently, and to a large degree successfully, prevented women from becoming 'skilled', even from getting a foothold in a workplace where they might eventually have stood a chance of 'skill'.

Debate on the relations of 'family', 'home' and 'work' has focused in particular around the aetiology of 'the family wage'. Hartman (1979) argues that the fight for the family wage for most adult men implied their acceptance and

collusion in inferior wages for women. By fostering a dual labour market, men assured women's economic dependence on them and thus their subordination and service. Hence 'men reserved union protection for men and argued for protective labour laws for women and children.' (Hartman, 1979, 16)

Interestingly, Hartman concurs with Tilly and Scott concerning the dating of married women's relative insignificance in paid employment: 'This "family wage" system gradually came to be the norm for stable working class families at the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth.' (Ibid., 16)

The issue is, however, not quite as simple as Hartman suggests. Her interpretation has been challenged by researchers examining the passage of particular legislation restricting or excluding women workers in certain occupations. Humphries, focusing on the case of the 1842 Mines Regulation Act, contends that male miners argued against their own interests in supporting the exclusion of their sisters and daughters from the mines. Women were not a threat to the men because men and women did different jobs. Moreover, since male face workers typically 'employed' their female kin to 'fetch' or 'hurry' the coal from the face, their exclusion would mean paying non-kin and a cut in family income. Barrett & McIntosh (1980) and Land (1980), on the other hand, cite evidence in support of the Hartman case, focusing particularly on the 10 Hours Act. They suggest that working-class men fought for the

shortening of hours for women because this would result in a reduction of their own hours while marginalising women and children.

There are difficulties, too, in timing. While Tilly, Scott and Hartman agree that the end of the nineteenth century is crucial, others, notably Snell (1981) see the change as happening much earlier.

Child labour has been much less discussed of late than women's labour, but the issues raised are similar. Davin (1982) discusses both the sources of external pressure for the exclusion of children from employment and the reasons for support from some sectors of the working class. Her starting point is industries in which men, women and children were already doing different work. There were, she says, two external pressures to exclude women and children. Changes in the labour process, including the introduction of new technology, encouraged their exclusion. And the second process was middle-class domestic ideology, with its emphasis on 'the family' of wife and children at home.

Davin also discusses the causes of working-class support for the exclusion of children from employment. Traditionally, working-class men, women and children, as soon as they were old enough to be useful, have worked to contribute to the household. In a domestic economy, however, children were under the supervision of adults in a more profound sense than in the cotton mills described by Smelser. The hours and pace of work were under parental

control. 'The support of sections of the working class for regulation of child labour thus stemmed from revulsion against the super-exploitation of their children, from dislike of their employment and training by others.' (Davin, 1983, 636) Only after listing these factors does Davin add: 'recognition that the regulation ... partly reduced competition on an over-stocked labour market.' (Ibid., 636) But there are clear problems of evidence here too, and the issue of children's employment must be regarded as being as unresolved as that of women's employment.

The middle-class woman and the ideal of the 'perfect lady'

On the surface, at least, things were clearer higher in the social scale. The complete separation of a woman from work and the total encompassing of her life by the family were major elements of the Victorian ideal of the 'perfect lady'. Although this ideal was probably substantially realised only by the more affluent middle class it remained 'tenacious and all-pervasive' throughout the Victorian period (Vicinus, 1972, x).

Although paid employment was incompatible with the status of 'lady', the upper middle-class Victorian woman did have a 'career' which involved considerable time and energy. Davidoff (1973) describes the 'career' sequence of 'schoolgirl, deb (or provincial variant), daughter-at-home, matron and dowager wielding power in the social political world.' (Ibid., 99) She notes that the elaborate etiquette

of calls and dinner parties was a serious and demanding home-based occupation, of significance for maintaining class boundaries, at least until the system of Society began to break down. Prior to this, at least, the image of the Victorian lady as totally idle is inappropriate. It is also inappropriate to imagine that the Victorian lady was wholly absorbed in family affairs as we now understand them. Davidoff notes that involvement in Society often ran counter to wishes for privacy and purely family life (ibid., 90). And 'household management' - a real concern of at least the upper middle class - was indeed management in households with several servants.

In the late 19th century the importance of Society diminished and incipient alternative ways of life for middle-class women were slowly developing. The basis of membership of Society widened and its role as an arena for political discourse waned. For some women the demands of Society persisted, despite these changes, even beyond the First World War. The war itself, however, helped the decline of the system by spawning inflation, exacerbating shortages of housing and perhaps slightly exacerbating the decrease in the pool of servants.

Alternative arenas of activity for middle-class women remained limited into the 20th century. However, they did exist and were expanding. Although not precisely quantified, it is clear that substantial numbers of women were involved in philanthropic work through the 19th century (Strachey, 1978; Summers, 1979). The

contradictory effects of this work on women are noted by Summers: 'Visiting the poor was a practice in part intended to transpose the values of the visitor's home to the working-class environment. The work confirmed the visitor herself in her own domestic role, and prevented her from finding a different status in society.' (1979, 57) But on the other hand: 'Philanthropic enterprise brought wives and daughters to discuss the privatisation of middle-class life and the confinement of women to domestic and familial roles, not in academic journals, but round the fireside, and with fathers, brothers, and husbands.' (Ibid., 60)

In addition to this voluntary work, the occupations that we now regard as 'traditionally female', nursing, clerical and secretarial work and teaching, were expanding arenas for middle-class women. A university education was readily accessible by the 20th century, even though the doors of the older professions were barely open (Strachey, 1978), and hardly at all to married women.

The Development of State Intervention

In the previous sections on the separation of home and work, and of male earners from women and children, the State has remained a shadowy figure in the background. Yet the frequent references to legislation indicate that the State played a significant role, and it is clear that an important aspect of the development of the State is the proliferation in State mechanisms for intervening in people's lives.

Although the Welfare State as we now know it did not exist, nevertheless, by 1900, State intervention into everyday life was already considerable.

State intervention in the family, in particular the contribution of the State to the creation of a clearly distinct status of 'child', has in the last few years become central to debates over the history of the family through the contribution of Aries(1973), Lasch(1977) and Donzelot(1979). This particular State intervention has been seen alternately as a liberation of the young and a further means of asserting middle-class dominance over the working class, and as an extension of a general and diffuse 'administration'. Luckily, there is no need, for our purposes here, to enter far into this debate; but the extent of State intervention in the lives of families and children in early 20th century Scotland needs to be charted. Indeed, the terms of the existing debate need to be widened. Not only 'childhood' but 'adolescence' is important - particularly given the focus in my data on the transition to adulthood. Although State imposition of 'adolescence', through compulsory secondary schooling, is beyond the period in question, discussion of 'adolescence' does of necessity address the question of the extent to which middle-class ideas about, and ways of conducting, private life were being 'imposed' or 'taken-up' by the working class.

While the processes involved were not uniquely Scottish, in what follows I shall focus particularly on the

situation, especially the legislative situation, in Scotland.

'Children should be at home or in school'

The separation of children from the labour force was only one of many new forms of discrimination between adults and children symptomatic of a reorientation of attitudes to children.

The 1872 Education (Scotland) Act was to create a uniform elementary education system; to establish even and adequate provision of State supported schools. Compulsory education removed children from paid employment more effectively than any Factory Act. Children were to attend school between the ages of five and 13 (raised to 14 in 1883), at least on a half-time basis. Exemption from school was permitted a year prior to leaving age in circumstances further specified and restricted by subsequent Acts of 1901 and 1908.

Efforts to ensure school attendance were standardised in the Education (Scotland) Act of 1883 which established procedures for summonsing parents of absentee children. By the 1890s the average attendance for Scotland as a percentage of the population of school age was 80%; by 1908 it reached 89% where it remained for some years (Witherington, 1975).

Legislative attempts at enforcing school attendance and impeding paid employment extended to part-time work out of school hours. Such work was a routine part of many

working-class children's lives (Thompson, 1977). The Scottish Council for Women's Trades conducted an inquiry in 1901 into the employment of Edinburgh school children (Keeling, 1914, 27). Of the 1,406 children they found to be employed, 159 were under ten years of age and 242 worked 30 hours a week or more. The first serious attempt to regulate children's work out of school hours was the sections of the Scottish Education Act of 1878 that prohibited late evening work.¹⁴ School boards were empowered to make bye-laws further restricting the employment of school children by the Employment of Children Act of 1903. The boards of Scotland's four cities were among those who thus formally established a minimum age and maximum working hours for employed school-children.¹⁵

Some MPs expressed concern at the idea of restricting children's opportunities to contribute to their household, seeing it as 'grandmotherly legislation', and/or discrimination against the working class.¹⁶ The retort that was given by a Scottish MP in 1908 to a complaint of this nature, concerning the legislators' definition of begging, is of some interest. The member he was addressing was worried that a child carolling in the street in order to collect money for a widowed mother would be categorised as begging. 'Recent legislation', he said, 'had endeavoured to prove to people ~~that the proper place~~ for children was in school and not in the street singing or doing other things with the object of getting money. [J. Jardine MP, as quoted in Parliamentary Debates (House of Commons) 4th

series, vol. 194, column 130, October 12th, 1908]. This reply no doubt reflected the dominant view of the house. Middle class belief and experience of childhood were that the child should be at home or in school. Legislation was to 'prove' this to people.

The problem of working class adolescents: neither at home nor in school

Like 'childhood', 'adolescence' is a historically specific category. Gillis (1974) argues that a recognisable life-cycle stage, 'youth', characterised by neither the dependence of childhood nor the independence of adulthood has long been a feature of our society. But 'adolescence', a period of relative dependence associated with the teen years is a 19th century development. This development was associated with middle-class reliance on secondary education. For sectors of the middle class, most notably the expanding professional middle class, too early an entry into the status of adulthood would damage occupational opportunities dependent on training.

Diffusion of 'adolescence' occurred at the turn of the century, according to Gillis (1974), despite the fact that only a very small proportion of young people attended secondary school. He claims that, in the face of economic stagnation, skilled workers were increasingly concerned that their children should receive training (but he provides no documentation of this). He points to changing leisure patterns as corroborative evidence of the 'take-up'

of adolescence among young people, and argues that the young of the skilled working class increasingly moved off the streets into the home or organised entertainment.

The development of institutionalised sites and forms of leisure which were segregated both from adult and child activities was a feature of the 19th century. Young men more than young women, and particularly working-class young men, were the target population of many 19th century leisure ventures. The Young Men's Christian Association (Y.M.C.A.), for example, was formed in 1844, incorporating such early organisations as the Young Men's Society for Religious Improvement (founded Glasgow, 1824). The movement for boys which 'held the field' in late 19th century Scotland was the Boys' Brigade (Eagar, 1953). Founded in 1883 for boys aged twelve - 17, by 1889 there were 232 Scottish companies with a total membership approaching 11,000 (Wilkinson, 1969). The class composition of membership remains unknown.¹⁷

The development of such youth movements has been interpreted as the consequence of the desire to contain and channel the energies of young men for whom leisure was neither organised around home nor around school: without such organised leisure, youth were regarded as liable to corruption. Something of the protection and separation of school-age children from the adult world had to be extended into the teenage years.

The proliferation of organisations for boys rather than girls¹⁸ indicates that the former were regarded as

more of a problem. Girls were seen as more contained in the home. The image of the juvenile delinquent which was developing in the late 19th century was that of a male youth. 'It was no accident that what the public came to regard as juvenile delinquency became the focus of attention precisely at the time that pressure to universalise adolescence were first becoming felt; for, despite their apparent dissimilarities, the two were related. The very traits that stigmatised certain youth as delinquent - namely, precocity and independence of adult authority - were precisely the opposite of those embodied by the model adolescent.' (Gillis, 1974, 137)

But the 'model adolescent' was middle class. S/he was not at work but in school. When s/he was not in school, s/he was either at home or taking part in suitable organised leisure.

The development of State powers for intervention in the name of the child

Compulsory schooling was effected by legislation which singled out young people for special treatment. Throughout the 19th century, particularly the late 19th century, a body of such age-specific legislation developed. Much of this was codified in the 1908 Children's Act. This legislation drew on and strengthened two assumptions: that children are not adults; and that legislation must support or enforce recognition of this by all, including parents. What exactly child/not-adult meant varied according to the

specific Act. Legislation declared for children special needs which were too important to permit parental discretion in their recognition. Thus Parliament, not parents, decided at what age children could work, should enter and could leave school, become involved in visiting licensed premises, drinking intoxicating liquor, placing bets, pawning items, buying tobacco, or having sexual intercourse.

This late 19th century plethora of age-specific legislation was targeted at the working class. The stereotypical bad parent the legislators had in mind was undoubtedly working-class; MPs were far less concerned about middle-class parents. At best, these bad parents were foolishly unmindful, at worst, they were calculatingly exploitative.

This concern to 'save the child', developed even at the expense of previously sacrosanct parental authority, and increased in the early years of the 20th century. The notion that the child was the adult of the future, the 'stock' of the nation and Empire, grew in influence. Increased economic competition for world markets between Britain and other countries (particularly Germany) set the context for the concern, and the pervasive threat (and occasional actuality) of war heightened it. Evidence of 'physical deterioration' was an immediate spur (Gilbert, 1966, 83-101). Anxiety about eclipse by foreign competitors was heightened by the sense of an internal

enemy, the criminal and insubordinate elements of the working class, the 'residuum' (Jones, 1971). Belief in the high fertility of the 'residuum' and the observed decline in the fertility of the middle class fed eugenicist concern for the 'stock' of the nation (MacKenzie, 1981, 36-42).

The remarks of Mr Crombie, a Scottish MP [introducing the Sale of Intoxicating Liquor to Children Act (1901) in the Commons], are illustrative of these concerns: 'The country finds that the question of temperance is no longer a question of argument but one of action. They have realised the evil that drink is producing on the nation. The right hon. gentleman the Home Secretary the other day gave us an eloquent picture of the connection between drink and crime. The question is not one of morals only, but one which involves our very national existence. Nothing is more certain than that in the future we shall have a keen struggle with the other nations of the world for our commerce ... The future still lies before us, and we can still save the children of this country.' (Parliamentary Debates (House of Commons), 4th series, vol. 91, column 568, March, 1901)

The 1908 Children's Act, codifying much of the age-specific legislation of the previous century, established in its definition of cruelty a legal statement of parents' minimum obligations to children. It included measures designed to protect infant life. Some historians, such as Pinchbeck and Hewitt (1969), have followed the Act's protagonists in viewing it as a 'Children's Charter'. But

other historians, like Gillis (1974), note the extent to which the Act, in conjunction with the Education Acts, increased the State's surveillance and control of young people and their parents.

A number of 19th century Acts made particular provisions for children who were begging or wandering. Two types of children were distinguished: those who were not in school because they were beyond control of their parents; and those who were not in school because of exploitative or unmindful parents. In either case a series of Industrial School Acts established procedure for the institutionalisation of such children. In such instances, school was asserted as of greater importance than home. Indeed it was the opinion of those involved in Industrial and Reformatory schools that they were struggling to undo the damage done at home, and that therefore the total severance of connections with home was desirable.¹⁹

But even ordinary schools contained an element of control over parents as well as children. By the early 20th century, schools promised not only education but medical inspection and feeding. Parents could be sanctioned not simply if their children failed to attend, but also if they sent their children to school inadequately clothed or verminous.

The consolidation of women and children as a category: the concern with motherhood

The same concerns that fed the campaign to 'save the

child' fostered a new focus on motherhood: 'Middle-class convention of the time took for granted that the proper context of childhood was the family, and the person most responsible the mother. So if the survival of infants and the health of children was in question, it must be the fault of the mothers, and if the nation needed healthy future citizens (and soldiers and workers) then mothers must improve.' (Davin, 1978, 12)

Infant mortality, for example, was blamed first on working mothers and then on ignorant mothers (Corr, 1983, 87; Davin, 1978, 24; Dyhouse, 1981). There was a growing conviction that women needed formal education in practical skills before they could perform their 'natural' duties efficiently (Corr, 1983, 76). Voluntary schools of cookery were formed throughout Britain in the 1870s, and small groups of campaigners argued for cookery and other domestic skills becoming a part of girls' schooling. Corr and Davin argue that it was the increased concern with the 'stock of the nation' at the turn of the century which resulted in the 'take-up' of their ideas. The teaching of domestic subjects in schools expanded most rapidly between 1901-1914, and in 1908 three of the voluntary cookery schools were taken over by the Scottish Education Department (Corr, 1983).

The early 1900s saw the birth of various new voluntary societies that had the working-class home as their target (Corr, 1983, 88). And the State too became more involved in

advice and instruction on motherhood, with legislation requiring the certification and training of midwives and the introduction of health visitors (Davin, 1978).

State and private forms of intervention were intertwined. 'State' intervention often relied on middle-class women, as philanthropists or, to use a more modern phrase, voluntary social workers. 'Unpaid women bore much of the cost, and indeed concealed much of the cost of the measures of State intervention which were adopted before the First World War. They assisted inspectors of mid-wives in their efforts to instruct mothers in the causes of infant mortality, acted as supervisors where school meals were provided, became visitors for School Care Committees, and performed a host of other functions which nowadays would have a wage attached to them.' (Summers, 1979, 57)

The impact of State intervention on the working class

There is no doubt that the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th was the peak of a first wave in State intervention in the family. Not only the government, but the civil service, the police, the courts, the education authorities, and the local authorities, were involved. Of course, the State, even in its many forms, was not acting alone. It responded to and influenced the plethora of largely middle-class voluntary societies. On rare occasions (as with the provision of State housing) it responded to working-class pressure.

The actions of State functionaries and middle-class volunteers are semi-documented. Almost nothing is known of

the response of working-class mothers to all this. Indeed, almost nothing is known of the working-class experience of State intervention in the family. Without this part of the picture we end up focusing much more on the intentions behind the intervention than the consequences. It is not possible to say whether the intervention was successful in its own terms.

Conclusion - the trees and the wood

This chapter has, of necessity, revealed the very considerable complexity underlying the application to actual history of apparently simple concepts such as 'industrialisation', the 'separation of family and work' or 'State intervention in the family'. These are the names of processes rather than states; and the processes to which they refer are uneven, complex and impossible to explain with simple uni-causal models.

Nevertheless, it is necessary from the point of view of the general direction of my argument to step back a little from these complexities, for there is always the danger of losing sight of the wood for the trees. All the provisos of the previous pages should not be read as denying that early 20th century Scotland was substantially a 'modern' society in the various meanings of modernity that are taken to explain the coming of 'the modern family'.

In the early 1900s, Scotland was almost as urban as at the present day and, in terms of the proportion of the population engaged in manufacturing, more industrial. As a

society, it was some way from subsistence, even if 'affluence' was obviously far from universal. Its class structure was distinctly modern, at least in the central belt, and few contemporaries would have doubted the separate existences of a working class and middle class, even if they might not have agreed exactly on the boundaries and internal composition of these classes. For class differences were visible in all aspects of life. Many middle-class households still had a resident domestic servant, while many working-class households contained little beyond the basic minimum of domestic furnishings and equipment.

These class divisions remained acute into the early inter-war period; in this respect, those born in 1905 inhabited a similar world to those born in 1895. Indeed, the 'quality of life' generally had not changed dramatically for these cohorts.

It was a society in which 'home' and 'work' were substantially separated for much of the population, and in which the occupational roles of women and men typically differed considerably. It was a society in which the separate status of 'child' was well established, even if its dominant sectors felt that legislation to firm up that separation was still needed. Indeed, it was a society in which the additional separate status of 'adolescent' was beginning to appear. It was a society in which the State (though not just the State, and certainly not just central government) had already begun to intervene in family life.

Indeed, around the turn of the century it was arguably a society experiencing an unprecedented (and unrepeated until the 1940s) wave of such intervention.

So, many of the social features referred to by the authors discussed above were undoubtedly present in Scotland at the time to which my data refer, even if that presence was an uneven and complex one. But documenting their overall presence is a very different matter from tracing their realities in people's lives and their relations with the more subtle webs of meaning and interaction that go to form family life. Here the oral record becomes indispensable, and the next four chapters seek to bring that record to bear in four areas that the authors in chapter two regard as crucial.

1. This view in itself may be partially the result of unreflective awareness of 'the modern family' as a private space partitioned off from the world at large.
2. Of course, for some authors the emphasis would be on the 'capitalist' whereas for others it would be almost exclusively on the 'industrial'.
3. The collection of articles edited by Giddens & Held contains representatives of the different sides of this debate. See also the collection edited by Neale (1983) and his own monograph.
4. See also Hobsbawm's interesting essay 'The Fashions Reconsidered' (Hobsbawm 1968, 250-71).
5. Among the most recent texts and articles are Gray (1981) McLennan (1981) Moorhouse (1981).
6. See, for example, Jones (1971).
7. Thus the full employment of the First World War and the mass unemployment of the subsequent Great Depression, showed the fallacy of the idea of a distinct 'residuum' of unemployables (Jones, 1971, 336).
8. 1901 Census of Scotland, Appendix, Table Xl11. The equivalent figures are, for Edinburgh, 37%; Aberdeen 39%.
9. 'Demographic transition theory', as originally formulated, does not fit the British or indeed European experience since fertility was already typically below its potential maximum because of late age of marriage.
10. Marriages include only marriages where the wife was age 22-26 and which were of a duration of 15 years or more

(Census of Scotland, 1911, Table XLVII).

11. Excluding the rural crofter.

12. For a critique of Smelser, but one which does not challenge this particular point, see Anderson (1976).

13. Mid-19th century Census enumerators often automatically put down women who were wives of men in certain occupations as similarly occupied. However, this practice was subsequently abandoned. See Holley (1978) for discussion of this problem.

14. The intention of this act was to prohibit all street trading by children under ten, although the actual wording failed this purpose. It did specify restrictions on the hours school children could work outside the home, however (Keeling, 1914).

15. Aberdeen set twelve as the minimum age for part-time work by school children. Ten was the minimum established by most other boards, including Edinburgh, Dundee and Glasgow. Each board specified a maximum number of hours work per day. The modal maximum was three and a half hours for children aged ten and eleven, four hours for children aged twelve and 13.

16. At the turn of the century the gibe of 'grandmotherly legislation' was still used to refer to unnecessary interference in other people's domestic affairs.

17. Various authors offer anecdotal indications of class composition: Gibbon (1953), Peacock (1954), Birch (1959). McFarlan (1982) asserts the membership were middle class without citing any evidence. Gray demonstrates the BB's

leaders were middle class.

18. Girls' Guildry was the sister organisation of the Boys' Brigade. It was formed in 1900, seven years later than the Boys' Brigade. I have not found a history of this organisation.

19. The view that children must be totally 'separated-off' from the contamination of their home environment was repeatedly and clearly expressed in the annual reports of the Inspector appointed to visit the certified Reformatory and Industrial schools. Children designated as neglected and children designated delinquent were alike regarded as bad children from bad homes. For example, Mr Legge commented 'In neither case can it be claimed as exactly to a child's credit that it has been committed to a school.' (46th Report for the year 1902, Parliamentary Papers 1904, 36, cd 1828)

CHAPTER FIVE

CHILD-CENTRED?

One way in which the modern family is generally held to differ from pre-existing family forms is in the emotional intensity of its relationships. The emotional intensity of the relationship between spouses, and of the parent/child relationship, was a key aspect of the accounts discussed in chapter two. The latter relationship, that of parent and child, is of particular import here. The modern family is not only emotionally intense, but is centred, emotionally as well as practically, to an unprecedented extent, around the child. Indeed, some accounts suggest that very intense affective relationships between parents and children are only possible when children are the emotional focus of the family.

Thus, assessing whether my respondents' families were 'modern' is in large part a matter of assessing whether they were emotionally intense and, linked to this, whether they were child-centred. This is the task of this chapter.

The focus in the literature on the parent/child relationship¹ is a fortunate one from my point of view. My material consists of accounts of growing up; the family is seen through the eyes of the child. So I have a great deal of information on the parent/child relationship, but only incidental pieces of data on the spousal relationship. For both practical and theoretical reasons I will thus concentrate on the parent/child relationship.

Measuring 'emotional intensity' and 'child-centredness' is far from easy, especially since (as explained in chapter one) it has to be done post hoc. I have considerable evidence on two key indicators - the amount of time and energy parents put into their relationships with their children, and the limits, demands and sanctions parents brought to bear upon children - and much of what follows draws on that.

It would be quite naive, however, to take 'time and energy spent' as a direct measure of emotional intensity. A key issue is obviously the extent of other demands on parents' time and energy. Just how much would they have had available to spend on their children? This is not merely an issue of concepts and indicators. For the removal of structural barriers to emotionally intense parent/child relationships is a key aspect of many accounts of the modern family. So some attention in what follows must be on other demands on parents, and the extent to which there were such barriers. I assume, however, that in a family which is already child-centred 'spending time with' children would be a priority, and therefore barriers to spending time with children would cause frustration.

The notion of the 'barrier' outwith this context has a weakness: it suggests that there is some natural parental emotional drive awaiting the right circumstances to appear. That may or may not be so (Shorter suggests it is so), but it is surely dangerous to assume it. And indeed we shall see below that most authors have an account of the growth

of incentives to intra-family emotionality.

Assessing the emotionality of the parent/child relationship must probe not just time and energy, but also actors' views of the relationship to which they are devoting these. Ideally I would wish to know both sides of the story, the views of parents and children. Of the parents I would ask: What sort of beings are children? What are a parent's goals in that relationship? 'Enjoying one's children' is but one possibility. Benefitting materially from their presence is another. Forming them into particular kinds of adult is a third. I assume that in a family which was already child-centred parents will enjoy their children and 'spending time with them' would be a pleasure in itself which needed no additional end for its justification.

Unfortunately, I must retreat to very imperfect indicators of parental attitudes: how their children remember them as behaving must substitute. Inferences about attitudes from behaviour can only be tentative. But children's memories of growing-up are not necessarily bad indicators of the nature of the parent/child relationship. It matters whether for them its dominant tone was of love and specialness, of service and subordination, or whatever.

Clearly, the emotional intensity of the parent/child relationship is closely connected to other aspects of that relationship. Above all, the parent/child relationship is typically a relationship of some form of authority. The

nature of parental authority, and the consequences of that authority for emotionality or its absence, are important topics to which I shall turn below. For the moment I wish to state that I assume that in a child-centred family parents do not treat their children as seriously inferior to themselves but rather they, as Burnett (1982, 52) suggests, treat them as 'full and valued members of intimate nuclear households, to be "talked to" not only in anger or sorrow, to be reasoned with, played with and enjoyed'.

Before moving to my own data, I wish to go back to the accounts summarised in chapter two, the inspiration for my assumptions, and to tease out some important themes in the authors' treatment of the parent/child relationship, their assumptions about the human capacity and need for emotionality, and their (and others') views on parental authority.

The authors reviewed in chapter two are in agreement that the amount of time and energy individuals devote to family relationships has increased historically. They are also agreed that these changes signify a major shift in attitudes. For some authors, for example Aries, attitudinal change preceded behavioural change: a new idea of childhood fostered changes in parents' treatment of their children. For others, like Zaretsky, structural change, at least for some sectors of the population, left family members with nowhere else to go for emotional support and thus changes in behaviour and attitude

followed.²

The accounts summarised in chapter two discuss changes in the parent/child relationship in terms of changes on the part of parents: it is changes in the attitude and behaviour of parents that are referred to. For example, parents are described as taking their children more seriously, showing them more affection, spending more time with them, treating them as individuals.³

It is, of course, recognised that 'parent' is not an undifferentiated category. Sex-role segregation is another distinctive feature of the modern family for these authors. All indicate that mothers were more involved in their children than fathers. It is women and children, in particular, who are 'separated-off' in the the new bounded entity of the family.

Similarly all the accounts assume that in 'the modern family' children are more 'separated-off' from the adult world than in previous family forms. This, too, is treated as an essential aspect of the emotionally intense relationship between parents, or at least between mother and child. Bringing up children cannot, it is suggested, become a task of serious devotion until childhood and adulthood are distanced.

Both women and children are 'separated-off' from 'work', but children are more radically distanced from the adult world. For example, for Parsons the distance between childhood and adulthood is the complement of the distance

between the family and the occupational structure. The father is the hinge between the family and the occupational structure. The child relates first to mother and then to father and then to the outside world.

For many of these authors it is not only the case that the parent/child relationship is emotionally more intense, but also that this relationship has become the emotional focus of the family. The family has become child-centred. Parsons suggests that a modern married couple require children for their own emotional fulfilment (1956, 20), Zaretsky talks of processes which encourage idealisation of the child and child-centredness (1976, 108-111). For Aries and Shorter the family is built around the child.

Aries' work has been extremely influential. For example, the following quotation from Lasch virtually paraphrases Aries: 'A new idea of childhood helped to precipitate the new idea of the family. No longer seen simply as a little adult, the child came to be regarded as a person with distinctive attributes - impressionability, vulnerability, innocence - which required a warm, protected, and prolonged period of nurture. Whereas formerly children had mixed freely in adult society, parents now sought to segregate them from premature contact with servants and other corrupting influences. Educators and moralists began to stress the child's need for play, for love and understanding, and for the gradual, gentle unfolding of his nature. Child rearing became more demanding as a result, and emotional ties between parents

and children grew more intense at the same time as ties to relatives outside the immediate family weakened.' (1970, 5 and 6)

These authors draw their evidence of changes in the emotional intensity of family relations from documentary sources. But this must mean both an impoverished and, a biased history. Unlike the authors in chapter two, I had the privilege of speaking to living people. I could ask people directly about the quality of their relationship with their parents.

But as indicated at the start of this chapter, respondents' comments about how 'close' they were to their parents cannot stand alone. They need supporting material before they can be interpreted. It is difficult to derive appropriate indicators of emotional intensity without a theory of its development, a sense of its essential components or its necessary and sufficient conditions. Often the relevant theorising in the selected texts is more implicit than explicit. For example, few accounts contain models of socialisation explaining the unfolding of emotionally intense bonds between parents and children throughout the family life-cycle.⁴ Nevertheless, it is possible to extract a sufficiently coherent model of the development of emotionally intense relationships to give an initial order to the analysis of my own data.

A number of assumptions about the natural human capacity and need for emotionally intense bonds underly the

discussion of historical change and individual development in the accounts. They are listed below from the general to the specific.

1. Emotionally intense relationships are not necessary to species survival or individual survival in all historically known times.⁵

2. Emotionally intense relationships can be the major source of an individual's psychological well-being in particular historical societies.

3. Emotionally intense relationships tend to arise between people when the frequency of contact is high and of long duration, and when there is also a sense of substantial investment and reward.

4. Emotional energy is finite and limited and therefore a large number of emotionally intense relationships cannot typically be sustained by the individual.

5. Patterns of sociability which involve the individual in spending time and energy in contact with large numbers of people are inimical to emotionally intense relationships.

6. Emotionally intense relationships between parents and children are inevitable if the former devote large amounts of time and energy to the latter.

These are the assumptions which lie behind the identification of 'the modern family' as the source of emotional support in modern industrial society, and the parent/child relationship as the emotional focus of the family. Modern society is not characterised by patterns of sociability inimical to intensive family emotional

relationships; indeed, beyond the 'separated-off' family there are few sources of emotional support.

Each author discusses the historical growth of incentives to spending time and energy within the family. The loss of alternative sources of emotional support outwith the family is a common theme. The loss of traditional patterns of sociability and the increased degradation of work are the main themes.

Although the references in some instances are to different patterns of sociability,⁶ in each case the assumption is the same: that the withering of dense and complex networks of sociability creates the need for emotionally intense family relationships. Negatively, it also leaves room for it: there is time and energy to spare for the family.

So changes in patterns of sociability create the incentive for emotionally intense family relations and free time and energy for them. They also shift the source from which the individual derives her or his identity. This aspect of the change is particularly developed in the work of Berger and Kellner (1964), epigones of Parsons and Durkheim. The shift is from a situation in which identity was maintained through the regulated and ritualised contacts of traditional patterns of sociability (Stone, Aries, Davidoff, 1973) or through the self-realisation of work (Zaretsky, Lasch) to one in which identity is maintained by emotionally intense relationships within the

family. This shift, of course, coincides with the 'separation-off' of the family from the wider social world.⁷

There are of course direct material barriers to spending time and energy with children, or to family relationships generally. For Shorter, the main barrier to spending time and energy on children was the burden of physical toil shouldered by the majority of adults. Historical changes in the organisation of production and consequently individual living standards lowered this barrier. A number of authors identify the demographic facts of high infant mortality and large family size as barriers to spending time and energy with children. Thus, factors associated with demographic change are part of the historical picture. In addition to these structural factors a number of authors, particularly Aries, emphasise the supplanting of attitudes of indifference to children, as parents began to think of children as different from adults and thus as having special needs.

Obviously, then, different authors produce different versions of the progression towards emotionally intense parent/child relationships, but their arguments share a common logic that derives ultimately from the assumptions listed above. Some authors add to these assumptions a more specific explanation of the quality of parent/child relationships. This can be summarised as saying that parental authority over children and emotional intensity between parents and children are inversely related.⁸ Very

severe parental authority and emotionally intense relationships are the antithesis of each other; the decline of the former causes, or at least permits, the latter to develop.

This explanation contains a set of assumptions about the exercise of parental authority. Severe parental authority requires the combination of the relative emotional irrelevance of the child to the parent and a balance of power which allows the parent to bully the child. Thus the parent's material and emotional resources must be generated independently of the child. Parents can then remain emotionally aloof and use control of material resources (money, housing, food, for example) to dominate and extract service from the child.

References to the nature of parental authority varying with the sanctioning resources at parents' disposal are made by a number of the principal authors including Parsons, Goode, Lasch, Stone and Zaretsky. This type of model features in the work of Anderson and other sociologists of the contemporary family including Harris and Leonard, and has been applied to the interpretation of major historical changes. For example, the removal of barriers to emotionally intense relationships within the family can be seen as changing the balance of power between parents and children. If parents become less emotionally aloof from their children, they are less able to bully.

The separation of home and 'work' is also seen as

important. Children's access to work and earnings is placed beyond parents' influence. Material and emotional vested interests are simultaneously disturbed. Parents' emotional needs are increased and their sanctions reduced. Some authors go on to argue that with no control of resources essential to the future well being of the child, modern parents 'buy' future affection and support through indulgence and 'spoiling' while their children are at home (Harris 1977; Barker and Leonard 1972, 1980).

Despite the attractiveness and interest of this way of thinking, the underlying model is problematic. The fact that parents can dominate is not an explanation of why they do so. Material interest is the usual reason given. For example, it is in the interests of working class parents to bully their children while they are young so that they'll hand over their wages unquestioningly when they're older (Stone, 1979, 127). The model assumes that parents consciously or unconsciously weigh up their material and emotional resources and assess how far it is in their interests to go in dominating their child.

So this approach reduces the interaction between parents and children to individualised rational calculation. But this interaction is surely influenced by wider norms of social conduct. Also, although trying to describe an interaction, the model is rather one-sided. It tends to forget that the less powerful can usually still fight back. The resources that children have at their disposal are often under-examined (Thompson, 1975), as is

the extent of parental vulnerability. Finally, and more fundamentally, any suggested opposition of emotional intensity and severe parental authority needs modification.⁹ It is possible, both theoretically and empirically, that a relationship between a demanding superordinate and an obedient subordinate might still be emotionally intense. Bell and Newby's discussion (1976) of the 'differential dialectic' between husband and wife is a case in point. I will return to the question of the opposition of emotional intensity and severe authority later in this chapter.

Time and energy devoted to children

Indicators of time and energy

Ideally, given the different emphasis of different authors and my assumptions concerning child-centred parents, I would discuss how much of parents' time and energy was concerned with the physical well-being of their children, how much with their psychological development, and how much with enriching and enjoying their relationship with their children. The devotion of time and energy to the physical and the psychological well-being of children is the corollary of a developed sense of 'the child' as needing such attention. Child-centred parents go further than this as spending time with children becomes a major source of pleasure.

My remarks are of a limited and tentative nature, based on children's comments about how and when they spent time

with their parents and others caring for them, and on children's comments concerning the level of parental care and concern.

It is difficult to draw boundaries round time and energy invested in children. For example, time spent in the presence of children is not equal to time invested in children. On the other hand, it might be possible to be investing time and energy in children when not actually with them. Most time spent in housework, such as food preparation for the family, could be viewed as time invested in children. This would be a rather indiscriminating approach, however. A narrower view is taken. For example, when discussing the physical care of children I include only measures directed specifically at children or undertaken largely for the benefit of children. When discussing parental time and energy devoted to the psychological development of children and to the enjoyment of their relationship, I look at the amount of 'free-time' parents and children spend together and at the ways in which they spend it.

Working-class parents: factors limiting time with children

Death is the ultimate limiter. At least a quarter of working-class parents experienced the loss of one or more child.¹⁰ Over a quarter of the working-class respondents lost one of their parents before the age of 20 and over a fifth before age 15.

The number of children in the family influences the amount of time parents have for each. The modal family

sizes (children surviving to adulthood) for my working-class respondents were 5 and 6, and the median was 6 (see Appendix 2).

Obviously, time and energy spent working is not free for spending with someone else, unless working with them. In working-class families of the period, mother, father and children had their time for each other reduced by the burden of work. Few fathers and sons worked together. Mothers and children, particularly daughters, might share the burden of domestic work and spend more time in each other's presence, but they usually did different tasks.

Unless invalided, fathers were earners. A working day could be 10 or even 12 hours.¹¹ The early rising of day workers meant early bed. In many households there were only a few hours in the evening, Sundays and perhaps Saturday afternoons in which working fathers could see their children if they wished to do so.

Domestic work, the cleaning, cooking and childcare and also the management of the family budget, were mother's responsibility, although some jobs were delegated to children. The arduous nature of housework at this time is well documented (Thompson, 1977; Roberts, 1977; for the '30s see Rice 1981). Cold water was on tap in some households, others shared a sink on the common landing of the tenement. Water had to be heated on the range. Few working class households had a gas cooker (some respondents' households had a single gas ring). Although

possessions were few in many working-class households, the place was not necessarily easy to keep clean. Bare floor boards, perhaps with the addition of rugs, were common, although better-off families had linoleum. Tables and surfaces were bare wood which, like bare floor boards, had to be scrubbed. Cleaning stuffs were primitive.

Food preparation and laundry were both more labour-intensive than today. Baker's bread, margarine, and perhaps cheese and butter, were the only ready to eat products purchased with any regularity. More of the preparation of food was done at home, gutting fish and washing tripe bags, for example. The most 'advanced' technology involved in laundry was the mangle.

The severely restricted budget that the mother was trying to manage forced her into labour intensive money saving work, like 'making down' clothes, mending and darning.

Large families meant frequent childbirth, nursing, large numbers to cook, wash and clean for and crowded rooms. Even in a 'three-apartment' every room had at least one bed. Bed recesses were common, and most kitchens had one and some two.

As well as being primarily responsible for domestic work and management of the budget, a minority of mothers were earners as well as their husbands. Some earned money by work they did at home. Bessie's mother, for example, a tailoress, added to the 18/- a week of her husband's wage by dressmaking at home. Others worked part-time like

Aillie's mother. She got the children up in the morning, left them to get their breakfast and went to work. She was back in time to make their mid-day dinner.

A few, like Maggie's mother, worked full-time.

"I wasnae much at the school because my mother had to go oot and work: she worked in a laundry. My dad in the docks. 5/6d a day and it wasnae every day they got a job. Oh, no! That's how she got me off the school so that I'd come into the hoose to watch the other yins and let her get oot to work. And that's just how things went." (Maggie, born 1899, docker's daughter)

Respondents whose mothers 'worked' usually present it as a case of no choice. This was certainly true of the widowed mothers, but it is also the way respondents, like Maggie, describe their mother's work when she was a second earner. Hatty's mother was perhaps exceptional, she chose to work rather than draw on her seaman husband's salary. When Hatty was young her mother was out at work unless her bachelor uncles had come to stay.¹²

"My mother was a very independent person. She wouldn't want to go and draw on his salary. That's what you could do long ago. She wouldnae do that, she'd rather go out to work and when father came back to an English port he would get his salary and send money up to mother and perhaps go away to Russia again." (Hatty, born 1902, seaman's daughter)

Although this willingness to earn was exceptional, many mothers must have taken it for granted that they might have to become earners. On the other hand, the children of widows often took it for granted that their mother would stop work once they themselves were earning. The respondents who were the elder children of widowed mothers clearly approached work with this in mind.

"Well, I was supposed to work to keep the family, you know." (Ina, born 1904, brass finisher's daughter)

In some households, married women were looked downon if they worked. Martha thought this was a general feeling in her mining village.

"There was a woman down the street who took in mangling and we thought it was terrible." (Martha, born 1904, labourer's daughter)

Her own mother managed on her father's army pension.¹³

If we accept that the majority of mothers who were 'working' did so from necessity, then a substantial minority of working-class mothers were forced to do so and therefore severely restricted in the time they could spend with their children. It is also the case that the burden of housework itself was very time consuming. What needs to be established, however, is whether making time for children was even conceived of as a priority.

School children often also worked and their work could take them away from home and parents. There were many different ways in which school children could and did contribute to the household income from part-time and casual jobs, fuel and food picked up somewhere, household chores and child care. Legislation had, on paper, restricted the number of out-of-school hours children were permitted to work (see chapter 4). There is no evidence that this legislation was effectively enforced in this period. Many boys and girls had part-time jobs and some respondents worked long hours.

The most common such paid job was delivering milk.

There was, in fact, a whole range of fetching and carrying jobs performed by working-class school children. It was, however, more common for boys to have a part-time job than girls. Over half of the working-class men I interviewed had such jobs and somewhat less than half the women.

There were other ways children procured goods for the house. Children foraged for fuel and competed for damaged, stale or surplus food-stuffs. Again these activities were somewhat more common for boys than girls. On the other hand, girls did far more work in the house. Almost all the working-class women interviewed had regularly taken part in housework or child care. This was true of less than half of the men.

Spending or not spending time together: working-class families

The behaviour of many working-class parents and school children creates an impression of avoidance rather than of spending time together; separate meals, largely segregated leisure, the ritualised nature of joint activities. This impression requires further exploration.

In many households parents and children did not take their meals together: they were separated in space or time.

"We weren't allowed to sit at the table. We had got our tea over a big blanket chest that sat in the corner. That's where we got our tea. We werenae allowed to take ours at the table." (Jimmy, born 1903, mason/builder's son)

"They had a big kitchen, you see. Well that's where they dined, you see, and, eh, we were put in the other room to keep quiet. But we used to make an awfie noise. Then you got your tea after the parents. You didnae get your tea with the parents." (Amy, born 1894, foreman book-binder's daughter)

And when children were allowed at the table they were expected to remain silent.

"I don't know if you know the golden rule, 'Children should be seen and not heard'. You were not to talk back to elders. You never joined in the conversation at the tea table. You were never allowed at the tea table if there were visitors in. Children were kept apart." (Angus, born 1902, tailor's son)

"We were sitting at the table and my brother laughed at something and I started to laugh. There was nothing to laugh at. We got one smack on the side of the face the both of us. My dad says, 'I didnae mind you laughing but when there is nothing to laugh at what dae you need to laugh at.'" (Effie, born 1900, brewery worker's daughter)

This demand for silence or the physical separation of parents and children are clearly aspects of the deference parents demanded of their children. Parental authority is discussed further in the next section.

As soon as tea was over, unless they had work to do, most children, particularly in the summer, went straight out the door to play. They spent very little time in the house before bed time. For many adults and children, part of Saturday was occupied by work but, free-time, again children often spent outwith the house.

Their playmates were other children from the neighbourhood and their games were organised and instigated without adult intervention.¹⁴ Occasionally adult women would join in the skipping games. But they were like welcome visitors, not essential to the play. Adult men were less likely to join in boys' street games, even football, a game also played by men.

Home based leisure for the whole family was more

common among the better-off families. It was often structured around music: the piano, the organ, the accordion, the gramophone.

"My father was good with the accordion and he could play the tin whistle and he learnt us the Spanish waltz in the room. That's the only time I knew about dancing." (Mary, born 1897, mason's daughter)

"We used to have evenings at home when we sat and sang. We had a piano and an organ and a gramophone and a speaking-in record-playing thing with a cylinder on it." (Nina, born 1903, plumber's daughter)

But musical evenings are usually remembered by respondents as something that happened when they got older, after school age.

There were a number of working-class respondents who were not allowed outside to play on winter evenings. They would read or play quiet games with siblings or more rarely with parents. Mickey's father, for example, would sometimes offer him a game of dominoes.

"Badweather my father used to [say] 'Come on, we'll have a game of dominoes. I always remember that, you know. I was always one of the outdoor type ... He used to love his game of dominoes. I'd block the ends when I could. He'd say, 'You're only spoiling it. If you want to get out, away you go.'" (Mickey, born 1895, miner's son)

As well as talking of musical evenings Nina also added:

"Then we used to have nights of playing ludo and dominoes and the like of that at home."

Many children had very few toys with which to amuse themselves: comics, clothes peg dolls, marbles, tops. Only the better-off would have anything more elaborate, a doll, board games, a variety of books. Davy's tale indicates how special a toy could be:

"It was a great experience to me. It was a terrible snow storm.... I was clearing the pathway at the foot of our stairs. And here, this lady came round and she handed me a paper bag, and it was a huge iced bun and there was a soldier on a horse. A metal soldier on a horse. Oh, I thought that was something great because them I never got before!" (Davy, born 1900, foreman railway porter's son)

Hatty's mother used to supply her and her sister with props when they were 'playing shops'. She would slice up a carrot and a potato for pretend merchandise. She also took the belt off her treadle sewing machine, so that it could be a pretend till without damaging the needle. This, however, is the only example from my interviews of a working-class mother supporting or participating in the imaginative play of her children.

Sunday, the day that the whole family could spend together, since virtually nobody worked, was largely spent in very formal activity: the church or the chapel, Sunday school, and the Sunday walk. Most parents regarded Sunday as a day which was not for play.

For some of the children whose parents were members of social clubs or societies there were sometimes other family outings at weekends. Nina's father belonged to a club which used to have dances, and the children were taken even when they were young. "You grew up with the family dancing." This sort of evening-out together was an occasion, not a regular event.

Many families did manage an annual holiday. A cottage was hired for a week or two in the nearby countryside or seaside. Those who weren't 'working', usually mother and

school children, went for the whole period. And the waged workers, if they could not manage holidays, came at the weekend. But the pattern of interaction at home was repeated on holiday. Children and parents would often spend most of the day doing different things.

Time spent together on a one-to-one basis: working-class parents and children

Many children received very little individual attention from either parent. Mothers might spend considerable time on childrens' appearance and physical well-being: producing clean clothes, making sure they were clean and free from lice, trying to make nutritious food. Respondents' accounts of their mothers suggest that those who had time beyond the immediately necessary domestic work spent most of that time on further domestic work, not playing with their children. This was not regarded as remarkable in any way. It is always dangerous to extrapolate from behaviour to beliefs, but the evidence strongly suggests that being a good mother overwhelmingly meant keeping a good house: clean and with good food. Home made jam and potted hough were priorities rather than playing with children.

Some mothers did spend considerable amounts of time with individual children. This was typically educative time. Frances' mother taught her and all her children to read before she went to school. She was certainly exceptional. She had been training as a schoolteacher before her disastrous marriage.

Several respondents' mothers and some fathers looked at

their school homework. Some mothers - Hatty's for example - took considerable pains to teach their daughters all they knew about cooking. It was more usual, however, to simply demonstrate what had to be done when delegating tasks and make no general effort at teaching domestic skills.

A few fathers made specific efforts to teach their children things. Jean's father was particularly exceptional. He took her round Edinburgh and told her the history of the closes. They went to the museum together. These trips were at least as much for Jean's benefit as for her father's diversion. Moreover they were established as something they did together.

A more common pattern was for a father to take one or two of his sons with him when he went to the football or the pictures. Pete's father took him to the football when he was nine or ten, although he never played with any of his children. This pattern could result in complaints of favouritism. A couple of respondents commented bitterly on how their brother was taken out and they were not.

For many men, playing was not a manly, and therefore not a fatherly, thing to do. Tom said this of his father when I asked if he ever played with him:

"My father wasn't one of that type. He was more of the, you know, straight fisted." (Tom, born 1897, miner's son)

Middle-class parents: factors limiting time with children

Even though death before old age was still a more common event than today, and a substantial number of my respondents lost a parent before they were 20, the

interruption of death was a less likely event among the middle classes. And parents, particularly in the professional middle class, typically had small families.

Middle-class fathers, on the other hand, could be away from home for as long a day as working-class fathers. Although few were as absent as Hatty's seaman father, business did take some away from home. Elizabeth's father was a commercial traveller and his absences clearly contributed to the lack of intimacy between them.

"He was away from home a lot and in some ways he was just the man who came to the house for weekends." (Elizabeth, born 1897, commercial traveller's daughter)

Catherine's father was also a commercial traveller. Her comments both express some affection towards her father but also indicate the absence of any real relationship with him.

"Father didn't seem to take a great deal to do with us but when he did see us he just put his hand in his pocket and gave us another penny or twopence or something. He was very good that way." (Catherine, born 1902, commercial traveller's daughter)

The burden of housework in the middle-class house was no less, despite smaller families. The house was bigger and the contents to be cleaned more elaborate. Domestic technology which might assist with cleaning and washing remained primitive, at least until the 1930s.¹⁵ Most middle-class households had paid 'help'. The majority of the professional and capitalist middle class had at least one, but often only one, maid, a resident domestic servant. Many small business proprietors and white collar workers

also had 'help' although not necessarily residential¹⁶.

Branca (1977) argued that the image of the Victorian woman as a lady of leisure is misplaced. Most of the middle class could only afford one servant. The whole burden of housework and child care could not be disposed of by a single maid, even although she was slaving from morning till night. Although there may have been some reduction in the burden of housework by the early 1900s, it was certainly the case that middle-class mothers with only one maid did have work to do. And, as pointed out in chapter four, those with more servants might find 'management' beginning to occupy the time saved in direct labour.

Nevertheless, a matter of considerable importance in understanding the relationship between middle-class mothers and their children is the division of labour between maid and mistress, because to a degree this was at the discretion of the mistress. Thus she could choose to delegate child care to the maid. Or she could attempt to use paid 'help' to free her own time for her children.

Division of labour between mother and servant

The dirtiest, heaviest work was normally the work of paid 'help': cleaning the fireplaces, washing the floors, mangling the laundry. A lone resident maid might also do some food preparation or cooking, answering of the door, waiting on table, or child care.

Dot was hired to do some housework and child care:

"There was a lady, and she had four nephews that she'd brought from India. Three were at school and one wasn't, so I just helped with the boys, this little boy, and helped

with the housework ... I used to teach them all to dance. I dunno if I was supposed to. I was certainly supposed to sit in the room to see that they got on with their homework but when they were finished with that I used to teach them to dance the highland schottishe and the highland fling and all the dances that I got at school." (Dot, 1904, linesman's daughter)

These children were the nephews of her employer but when their own mother returned, pregnant, Dot's involvement was not reduced. She says of the fifth child, "I brought that one up. I had him from when he was an infant."

Florence's family maid was called a nurse-housemaid, and clearly had a similar kind of remit to Dot. This maid took Florence and her siblings out for a walk every afternoon when they were pre-school age. There was another maid in the house at the time.

Among my respondents, the majority (seven out of eight) of the capitalist middle class had a nurse (house)maid or nurse when the children were young. This was also true of a couple of the professional families (two out of six). Often the term 'nurse', and sometimes 'nanny', referred to someone who takes charge of an infant from birth. Kate was this kind of nurse.

"I was always fortunate really. I never had very much trouble with them [young babies] during the night. And I was once recommended by a doctor as being a very naturally efficient nanny. I was very fond of children, of course. I probably had the instincts to know just how to handle them. Of course if it was a young baby it meant being up about half past five. First feed at six o'clock, you know, and last feed at ten o'clock at night. But I loved it." (Kate, born 1908, steel erecting engineer's daughter)

Kate's training was in her first job. Her mistress was a gentleman-farmer's wife with two children, and about to have a third. The household also contained a cook and a

house/table maid. A state-registered maternity nurse was hired for six weeks before and six weeks after the birth of her new charge.

Some mothers ~~de facto~~ delegated the entire care of their children to a paid servant. Kate had such a job.

"My last job that I had before I got married were two boys whose parents were in India. Father was a doctor in India. They [the boys] lived with the grandparents in Edinburgh. That was a nice post. I liked that. Of course, I was my own boss there, more or less. Not that I minded being bossed, but I mean, the doctor, Dr Miller, he used to come home every third year, but Mrs Miller, the mother, came home every year for the sake of the children. The little one, when I took him over, was three and the older boy was about seven. There was one had died in between on the way out to India. The third one was born out there but she brought him home at three months old and she wouldn't take him out again. So that's why he was always left at home with me."

When parents and children were actually living in the same household, such an extreme delegation of responsibility was still possible. The nursery system in its most developed form meant the complete separation of children from the rest of the household, under the supervision of a nurse or nanny.

Only Grace, Caroline and to a lesser extent Fiona among my respondents were brought up in households with a nursery that was used as such. Mother and father were uninvolved in their everyday physical care and also spent little leisure time with them¹⁷.

"My mother, you know, never had charge of us. She liked to see us but then when we got rather obstreperous we were banished again. ... Then at the age of eleven I went to boarding school. We all went to boarding school. My mother said it was the happiest day of her life when we went to boarding school." (Caroline, born 1910, mill owner/manager's daughter)

"I wasn't so much brought up by a nanny as the others because I was so much later. But we certainly had a nursery and a play room and we were left to ourselves. Well I was." (Fiona, born 1901, merchant's daughter)

In the fully developed nursery system, children, like Caroline, were dressed smartly and taken to the drawing room to be with their parents for an hour, perhaps daily. Otherwise contact depended on the frequency of parents' visits to the nursery. Grace's mother never visited her in the nursery. This pattern lead Thompson (1977,62) to conclude that 'in fact there can be little doubt that the most distant parents were to be found among the well-to-do.'

In most of the middle-class respondents' households there was a lesser delegation of child care to paid help. But in Catherine's case, even although there was no nursery as such, there was little informal contact between her and her parents.

"We spent a good deal of time with the maid. She wasn't a young, inexperienced person: she was always a .. Well we had one, she must have come when she was quite young. We had her for fully ten years and when she left to get married her sister-in-law came and she was with us for about ten years till she got married. Actually, there was just the two all the time I was growing up ... I didn't see such a great deal of my parents, because if we were playing in the house we were in the huge kitchen with the maid, mostly there, so that I didn't really see such a great deal of my parents from that point of view. ... If we had visitors, in those days, of course, it was a case of afternoon teas perhaps. Mother had her circle of friends and each one had an afternoon 'at home', and we were dressed up to go in and meet the visitors and have our tea with them. But they did a lot of entertaining in the evening, which, of course, we were not allowed at table with them in the evening if they were entertaining. We usually had our meals in the kitchen with the maid under these circumstances. ... I can't ever remember really being unhappy in my young days. I can say that. I don't

remember getting a lot of attention from my parents. I really can't remember my mother ever, you know, taking me in her arms or anything like that but we were happy somehow or other ... we were left pretty much to amuse ourselves and get on with it." (Catherine, born 1902, commercial traveller's daughter)

The free-time of middle-class children

Both working-class and middle-class children often had school homework to do in the evening. This obviously reduced their free time. Some middle-class children had a private tutor or governess to add extra lessons at home and in addition almost all had private tuition in music, most commonly piano lessons but also violin and singing. Some went to dancing lessons and some to elocution. Piano lessons meant piano practice. This was sometimes experienced as an unpleasant chore.

Many had few other chores to do. Among my middle-class respondents, involvement in housework, as school children, ranged from considerable to none. In households where mothers did almost no domestic work then this was also true of their children. But not all mothers who were doing a lot of housework wanted help from their children.

In Violet's and Alexander's household, where there were no domestic servants, daughters did a considerable amount of housework. Violet said: "I learned to cook quite early. Oh, yes: washing up the dishes, ironing and washing." In some households with 'help' children were expected to do housework:

"Oh, well, we all had our jobs to do, bedrooms to keep clean, to help with the dishes, because it was such a big house." (Rachel, born 1899, minister's daughter)

But boys were typically exempt:

"My mother was a very practical person. She was always doing something like baking. She encouraged us to help. ... Boys in those days weren't really expected to do housework, although my brother cleaned the shoes." (Irene, born 1903, accountant's daughter)

Irene's domestic involvement remained limited. Her mother died when she was 17. She said that then she realised how little experience of housework and cooking she had. Moira did little in the house and was not given much encouragement for her efforts. "Mother wasn't very keen on my attempts at cookery." Elizabeth had to do some housework when she was in her teens.

"I think I had to keep my own room tidy and do the dishes at the weekend, help with the washing-up. I never really did anything in the way of cooking until two summers during the First World War we had a cousin's house [for the summer]. The first year we brought the maid with us. The second year I don't think we had one. I had to do some cooking then." (Elizabeth, born 1897, commercial traveller's daughter)

Similarly, Grace did some cooking after the war, because they had lost one of their maids. Several respondents did no housework as children, teenagers or young adults, despite being women. Emily is an example.

"I had no duties to do at home. ... My mother used to say it was extraordinary that I never took an interest in doing the drawing room; dusting the drawing room, and arranging [flowers], you know." (Emily, born 1888, stockbroker's daughter)

A few middle-class children helped their father with his work. Irene was thought to be good at mathematics. Her father often brought work home and she would sometimes help with it. She would also do some work in her uncle's office during the summer holidays. This was exceptional

among the respondents, however. Homework and music practice were the most pervasive limiters of free-time.

School-aged middle-class children, like working-class children, spent much of their free-time other than with their parents. Often, rather than playing in the street, they were in their own or friend's garden, or home. They had more to play with and more to read. Several respondents volunteered the fact that they were voracious readers as children. They were also more likely to be members of clubs and associations, even from quite a young age. Both boys and girls were more likely to be involved in some form of sport.

The tennis club was often an important social nexus for children and young people. It was often possible to join the junior section of a local tennis club from about the age of eight. The tennis club was one of several avenues into rounds of parties. Going to parties was a reasonably frequent social event for children and young people.

Middle-class family time and individual time

Obviously the amount of time the family spent together as a family partly depended on the extent to which children were separated-off in a nursery or 'with the maid', and on the other demands on parents and children's time described above. All respondents remember going to church on Sunday as a family. Although not all parents were strict Sabbatarians, for most people Sunday remained a day which was spent rather formally. Some middle-class respondents,

like some of the better-off working-class respondents, remember family musical evenings at home. The piano was a feature of most middle-class homes. But again, this entertainment was not particularly for children. Most remember a family holiday. But again, the holiday did not necessarily result in middle-class parents and children spending time together. For example, Catherine's father, who was normally very absent from home, did not use his holidays to spend time with his family. He only joined them at weekends as usual, and spent the week on his hobby of judging at Agricultural Shows. As with working-class families, the pattern of interaction at home was repeated on holiday.

Some respondents remember a family outing to the theatre or the pictures. Rather more remember being taken by their father. Educational outings were obviously father's province in many families, and again this seemed to be the dominant way that fathers spent time with their children. Several respondents, like Elizabeth, sometimes accompanied their mother when she went out: for example, when she went round the shops to settle the monthly accounts. But as with most working -class respondents, daughters of the professional and capitalist middle class did not remember their mothers taking an everyday part in their play.

The exception was the daughter of a butcher, sufficiently prosperous to own his own stock. The only

'help' in the house was a woman who came in once a week to do the washing. Dorothy remembers her mother taking part in imaginative play. For example, she helped her make a play house in the garden with a clothes-horse and old rugs. Like Hatty's mother, she too provided materials for playing shops and also for dressing up.

The nature of parental authority

Indicators of the nature of parental authority

In this section I look at the exercise of parental authority: at activities demanded and encouraged by parents, those forbidden, and at the sanctions brought to bear in the event of rebellion. I also discuss the extent to which parents and children were engaged in a 'deferential dialectic'. This is approached through the child's experience and understanding of parental authority.

There are occasions on which I will make inferences about parents' motives from the experience of children. This is a dangerous exercise and I do so sparingly and with caution. For example, almost everyone I interviewed was expected, as a school child, to go to bed at a certain time, to wash at certain times and to eat "everything put in front of them". It would be possible to conclude that these restrictions simply reflect a universal concern with the physical well-being of the child. This is not the end of the story, however. As such it would be a dangerous oversimplification. Thompson (1977,58), for example, describes how some working-class mothers tried to get children to bed early so that their husbands would have

more space and quiet in which to relax. This would not apply in better-off, middle-class homes.

A comparison of Belle's and Elizabeth's refusal to eat something shows how rebellion against the same ruling can result in extremely different experiences. Belle was from a large working-class family. There were probably nine people in her household at the time of the incident. Elizabeth, on the other hand, was an only child of a middle-class family.

Belle had asked her brother at school what was for dinner.

"'Mince.' He didnae want to tell his chums that it was broth or potato soup. Mince you never got till you worked. And I went home picturing mince. That would be a treat for me. So I run up the stair and said 'Oh, mother!' My mother dealed out two ladles of broth. 'Hughie said its mince.' 'Oh, no! It's only the big ones get mince; the workers that get mince.' I said, 'Oh, mother, just give me bread and jam!' [Mother said] 'That's your dinner.' I said, 'I'm no taking it.' A thing I regret all my life. Because I went back to school and I got punished. I was sitting and the teacher was speaking and I was picturing the broth. I was starving. Wish I'd taken that broth and two slices of bread. When the teacher said, 'You are not paying attention', I couldnae tell her I was thinking of my dinner. I got punished. And as soon as the school was out, up the street I run. 'I'm not playing today, I'm going home for my dinner.' My mother was at the wash tub. The wash tub was half a barrel on the floor and she was on her knees scrubbing. I said, 'Oh mother, I'm dying for my broth! I'm sorry I never took my dinner at dinner time. I'm dying for my broth now.' 'Oh,' she says, 'Belle, waken up! With a big crowd there is always somebody ready for another plateful. There's no broth. You'll get nothing. Do your homework.' I said, 'Oh, mother!' 'Do your homework. You're getting nothing. It'll teach you a lesson. I've got nothing. Bed!' And I had to rise at half past five the morrow to go for the milk."
(Belle, born 1900, shoe-maker's daughter)

"I was made to sit and look at rice pudding for a whole afternoon, because I wouldn't eat it. And then they forgot about it, because when my mother, my mother had been a

governess in a big family, and one of the children there had been made to sit and look at pea soup for a whole day and then she developed jaundice, and the doctor said it was the result of this looking at the green soup. I don't know how much truth there was in that, but that taught my mother a lesson." (Elizabeth, born 1897, commercial traveller's daughter)

Demands made by parents: class and gender differences

Working-class children contributed materially to the household in several ways. Their multifarious contributions were not matched by middle-class children. Middle-class children, as noted above, often made no significant contribution to housework and never contributed an income to the household. The class differences in contribution to the household raise the question of whether working-class parents were demanding service from their children in a way that middle-class parents were not. In terms of the model of parental authority criticised earlier, were working-class parents able and willing to bully their children while middle-class parents were not?

Given how close many working-class families were to being below subsistence, it would seem reasonable to guess that some working-class parents would bully their school age children into part-time jobs. This is clearly what the 19th and early 20th century legislators discussed in chapter four believed. However, my interviews indicate that the part-time jobs of school children were most usually taken on at the child's initiative, without pressure from either parent. This is in spite of the fact that if a child was working part-time or doing odd jobs it was taken for granted that her or his earnings would be handed over

'to the house'. The following quotation illustrates the sense of choice:

"Didnae have to do anything. Did it because I was always energetic. I could see the way my mother was struggling."

On the other hand, mothers often explicitly demanded domestic work of their children of both sexes, or of their girls. Indeed, there were a number of household tasks that were generally regarded as children's work: shoe polishing, burnishing the steels, cleaning the cutlery, polishing the brasses, black-leading the range, getting the messages, running other errands. In some households, though, some of these tasks would be regarded as only appropriate for girls.

The following quotations illustrate the demands mothers made on children. In the first quotation a woman is describing her childhood involvement in housework.

"... and on a Friday night everything had to be cleaned and put back again. Oh I'd [to do] all that, and if I was late in coming in my mother was there meeting me at the schoolI'd be playing and she'd give me a row for being late." (Ina, born 1904, brass finisher's daughter)

The second quotation is a description of the division of labour that the respondent's mother imposed on her and her younger sister.

"I sympathise with a person that's the oldest girl because she does get it put on her. She [younger sister] would get out. When she come out of the school my mother would say 'Get the wee one ready.' Well she would take her [the wee one] oot. Well she used to be able to go oot and she would leave her at the side of the road and play at jumping ropes and that and I had to go in and scrub the floor or wash. I was standing at the green ... hanging up clothes [standing] on a tin box or something because I couldnae reach the line." (Betty, born 1905, miner's daughter)

Not all girls were expected to do such heavy housework as Betty. However, the experience of having to do housework was not exceptional.

The fact that housework and not paid work was demanded by working-class parents suggests they were not rationally calculating the maximum material benefit they could extract from their children. At the same time it was not generally the case that working-class parents regarded paid work as unsuitable for school children, since very few objected when they took on this work.

Several factors may explain why it was housework, not paid work, that typically was demanded of working-class children. These factors are assumptions about status rather than calculations of benefit. Crucially, it was assumed that children ought to be in the service of adults. Paid work was not typically direct personal service. It did not express deference in the same way as regularly accepting that you 'have to' do housework. In addition, though, gender is vital here. As children ought to service adults, so women ought to service men. So, as discussed in chapter eight, a double burden fell on daughters.

Jimmy's father was apparently almost a caricature of this attitude that children and women are at the service of men:

"He never spoke to us in the house. Never heard his voice. And if he wanted a cup of tea, he rattled his spoon in his saucer for my sister to pour out his second cup of tea. Oh, it wasn't an easy life! But it was really much more different and much easier when we went out to work, because I went to be an apprentice joiner, he was a mason builder, and we invariably quite a lot landed in the same job. But

outside I was just the same as any other boy or man on the job. But he never spoke to me in the house." (Jimmy, born 1903, son of mason/builder)

Middle-class parents also wanted their children to show deference. But the form this took was more a demand simply for obedience and respect, not typically for personal service from their children. Furthermore, they were often more equivocal in their exercise of authority. For example, Elizabeth's successful refusal to eat rice pudding was one of several victories. On one occasion she was put to bed for being naughty, instead of going out with her mother. She screamed and cried. Her mother came in and told her to stop or she'd have a fit. Elizabeth decided to scream more to see what a fit was. Her mother got her up, dressed her and took her out. Moreover, she had an ally in her aunt who often came to stay.

"My aunt was a very gentle, loving person; and after dinner she said to my mother, 'I won't stay in this house another day if you two go for that child like that. First one of you says, "Sit up" and the other one says, "Hold your fork properly" and you gave her no peace.'" (Elizabeth, born 1897, commercial traveller's daughter)

Deference

Parental authority is typically regarded as natural. In Weberian terms it is legitimated by tradition. The child deferring to the parent is acknowledging and maintaining traditional authority. Deference was expected of children. Many understood that you showed respect for most adults by speaking only when spoken to, always doing as you are told, and never answering back. There were exceptions, and the demand for deference was rather gentler

in many middle-class households. Many working-class people volunteered the maxim 'children should be seen and not heard'. Many, like Angus quoted above, were explaining the everyday. A few, like Jane, were referring particularly to when there were visitors:

"If we were having visitors mother would say, 'Now we're having visitors. Now behave yourself and no noise. If there's any noise you know what you'll get after they go away.' In a nice way. She told us things in a nice way. But she never needed to [smack us] because, say we were maybe talking too loud, my mother would just need to turn round and look at us. Now that was enough." (Jane, born 1899, engine driver's daughter)

When middle-class respondents were asked if this maxim was practised in their home they were more often tentative.

"If there were a lot of grown-ups you were expected to keep quiet and not make a fuss. It seemed to come quite natural." (Florence, born 1902, chartered accountant's daughter)

Helen's response was:

"I wasn't kept like that. I was able to talk to the minister when he visited even at the earliest age." (Helen, born 1896, owner/manager's daughter, engineering business)

But she was an only child and exceptionally close to her parents. 'Being cheeky' remained unequivocally an offence regardless of class. Although exactly what was regarded as cheek no doubt varied. Florence was "sent up stairs" and then smacked with a hairbrush by her mother for being cheeky and refusing to apologise to the cook. She had "cheeked" the cook when the latter complained about the mess Florence had made on the dining-room table. The only smacking Emily, another middle-class daughter, remembers was for cheeking her aunt.

In the following quotation a working-class woman describes the consequences of a similar double rebellion. Amy was 'setting up cheek' or 'answering back' and failing to obey.

"My mother wanted me to go messages and I wanted to play ... I was going to the door and she said something to me and I shouted, 'Shut up!' Well, when my dad come home ... of course my mother told my dad ... I never sat down for two days after it."

(Amy, born 1894, foreman bookbinder's daughter)

Pat's father used a similar method of reminding her that obedience was needed immediately and without comment.

"He said something. [I said] 'Oh, wait the now!' And he took a hold of me and skelped me. Smacked me on the bum. I can always mind of that [laughing] for just saying 'Wait the now.' He says, 'Now if you were at school would you tell your teacher to "wait the now"?'" (Pat, born 1903, second-hand shop proprietor's daughter)

In these examples physical force is used by fathers to re-
mind children who is boss. It has been suggested (Burnett, 1982, 47) that the code of conduct was set by the mother and enforced by the father. This division of labour was not absolute. By no means all mothers adopted as a threat 'I'll tell your father', and among those who did often threat did not amount to anything. This, of course, was not the case for Amy quoted above. In the majority of households, physical punishment from father was rare or unknown, even if he was formally the ultimate authority. And in some households neither mother nor father hit their children. Fathers sometimes introduced prohibitions. The time children and young people had to be in at night was often set by father, for example.

Parents did not have to rely on physical coercion as,

in general, children recognised the authority of both their mother and their father as legitimate. In many families children were almost never smacked and would nevertheless show considerable deference to their parents. Bell and Newby (1976) argue that to maintain a deferential relationship the superior has to find ways of simultaneously emphasising their superiority, on the one hand, and their sympathy and commitment to the subordinate on the other. They suggest that gift-giving is the most obvious way of doing this. Children are the receivers of gifts from their parents. Nearly all respondents received pocket money or sweets once a week from their parents while they were at school. For many, both working-class and middle-class, money and clothes remained gifts until they were in their late teens or early twenties.

Bell and Newby (1976, 157) further argue that gifts cannot be lavish if they are in order to emphasise the differentiation and hierarchy between superior and subordinate as well as the identification between them. This also appears to apply to the parent/child relationship. As pre-teenage school children, working-class and middle-class respondents alike typically got only a penny a week pocket money. Florence used to be playmate to "an heiress to millions" who, like herself, only got a penny on a Saturday.

Gifts, and the demands for 'good behaviour', were the major elements in what Bell and Newby (1976) call the

'deferential dialectic' for middle-class families. In working-class households, 'good behaviour' to a greater extent meant obedient service. Mary remembered her mother putting together a gift and a demand in one sentence, thus emphasising the double-edged nature of the gift:

"If father was idle she [mother] would get a pound of sugar, it was only a penny then, and make toffee and say, 'I cannae give you all money this week but there's toffee and, after you get that done, there's twelve pairs of boots to polish.'"

Her mother also used to emphasise the effort she had made to provide her children with nutritional food.

"Mother used to make rice and say, 'Eat up all your rice 'cause there is an egg in it to make it rich for you.'" (Mary, born 1897, mason's daughter)

Conclusion

On balance, my respondents' families seem to have been neither child-centred nor emotionally intense. Neither working-class nor middle-class children spent much time playing with their parents. The idea of parents and children spending time together simply for their mutual enjoyment is not greatly in evidence. Spending time with children was not a priority in many households.

Time was devoted to children by parents, but parents and children did not spend time together in a way which indicates a child-centred family. And such limited time as parents and children did spend together does not seem to have resulted in emotionally intense relationships.

Some working-class parents and many middle-class parents, particularly fathers, made a point of taking their

children on educational outings. In some cases, spending time together may have been or become as important as the educational element. Some parents took children, or more usually a child, with them when they went about their own business or leisure. And, of course, time was devoted to the physical care of children, although in many middle-class houses some of this work was delegated to servants.

The idea that a mother should devote herself to her child, first and foremost, may have been present in some such households. There is little positive evidence, rather an absence of clear counter-evidence. The fact that the mothers of several middle-class respondents chose to delegate child care to the single maid indicates that the adoption of this view was far from all pervasive. It is less conceivable that working-class mothers could have entertained such an idea. The evidence suggests that the notion of 'the child' as fragile, unfolding flower, as a being requiring devotion, was largely absent.

For working-class children, the separation of 'childhood' and 'adulthood' was not complete. Children were not exempt from the responsibility of maintaining the household as they were in many middle-class families. Working-class parents expected children to expend time and energy in their service. Parental concern to protect and shelter their children from the adult world was less pervasive.

A working-class mother's priority was good housekeeping, not her children as such. The division of

labour between mistress and servant suggests that this priority may have been shared by some middle-class mothers. Present-day mothers often express dismay at the conflicting demands of housework and child care (Oakley, 1974). Davidoff suggests that this conflict was not generally experienced among the middle-class until the 1920's and 30's (Davidoff, 1976, 147). I am suggesting that, in the early 1900s, the conflict was not similarly experienced since housework and, more generally, good housekeeping was the clear priority.

I am not arguing that affection was absent: as Burnett notes (1982, 53) 'love takes many forms'. But the formal and reserved nature of interaction between many parents and children, both middle-class and working-class, cannot be called child-centred. Often the affection respondents expressed for their parents, particularly mother, did not result from many pleasant hours spent together but from awareness of the toil and trouble parents had keeping the family together. Toil which was particularly visible in the case of mothers, especially to daughters. Indeed, some mothers made a point of emphasising to children the effort they went to on their behalf.

Some of the reserve between parents and children can be accounted for by the deferential distance between them. Most parents expected their children to show deference to them. In the model of parental authority criticised earlier, severe parental authority and emotionally intense

relationships between parents and children were thought to be mutually exclusive. However, by demanding deference from their children parents were not eliminating the possibility that they would also receive affection. Whether by conscious design or not, many parents had ways of showing that they were benevolent bosses.

"We had respect for them. There was love in the home. And I never knew my father to raise his hand to any of us."
(Jean, born 1895, cabinet maker's daughter)

It is also clear that not all succeeded and some parents were feared or even hated rather than loved.

But this style of parental authority, the demand that traditional authority be recognised, although not necessarily excluding affection, is not child-centred. The emphasis is on the beneficence of the parent, not the marvel of the child.

The absence of emotionally intense child-centredness was not class specific. Though it obviously took different forms, it was as noticeable in the middle class as in the working class. If there is any class location where child-centredness was to be found, it was perhaps in the 'boundary' of these two classes. In some of my upper working-class families, and in lower middle-class households less integrated into middle-class patterns of sociability, child-centredness was, to a degree, evident. But even there it was scarcely emotional child-centredness. Time spent on children was still predominantly on their physical care, and on their education, not on 'enjoying them'.

1. It is not the case that all the authors stress the parent/child relationship as ~~the~~ the major emotional axis of the family, although this is true of the 'sentiments school'. The functionalist authors, Parsons and Goode, talk in terms of the 'conjugal' family, indicating by this choice of term which relationship is the 'keystone' of the family. Nevertheless, they also stress an unprecedented degree of emotional intensity in parent/child relationships. Parsons talks of how parenthood acquires 'an enhanced significance for the emotional balance of the parents themselves' and how 'the two generations are, by virtue of the isolation of the nuclear family, thrown more closely on each other' (Parsons and Bales, 1953, 19 & 20).
2. For authors like Goode, behavioural change preceded attitudinal change for some sectors of the population, while attitudinal change preceded behavioural change in others. Upper-class parents were influenced by individualistic notions about the rights of the child, but had a vested interest in primogeniture and control of marriage. Working-class parents had no such resources to sanction their control of their children, but were less influenced by ideas of internal family democracy.
3. Moreover, the amount of time and energy parents devoted to children and the emotional intensity of parent/child relationships, although analytically separable, are not necessarily always regarded as empirically discrete events.

For example, in Parsons' account, in order to achieve successfully the creation and maintenance of psychologically stable individuals, there is simultaneously increased expenditure of time and energy invested in childrearing and an intensification of the emotional atmosphere in which it takes place. Similarly, in Shorter's account these are not empirically divorced events. Shorter emphasises the changes in the amount of time and energy mothers invested in the physical care of their children more than Parsons does. Parsons tends to concentrate on changes of more direct consequence for psychological development. However, Shorter predicates changes in concern for the physical well-being of infants on the 'surge' of maternal love, thus binding them to changes in the emotional intensity of parent/child relationships.

4. Parsons is the dominant exception but Lasch and Stone also draw on Freud in their accounts of the psycho-dynamics of family bonds. All three stress, in the case of 'the modern family', the psychological significance of the initial closeness between mother and child and the more distant relationship to the father.

5. Stone, for example, argues that people of pre-modern times were hardly capable of affection.

6. The patterns of sociability which appear in the literature range from the traditional round of feudal sociability, of festivals and harvest homes; to Victorian "Society", with its seasons; to French working class

sociability of cafes and cabarets; and the sociability of extended kin exchanging goods and services.

7. In general terms the structural and ideational shifts identified in the accounts as creating the circumstances favourable to "close" parent/child relationships are those which fostered the "separated-offness" of the family.

8. This formulation is far from the position of some of the principal authors discussed. For example, for Lasch the "union of love and discipline" means the combination of emotionally intense parent/child relationships and strong parental authority, and there is nothing paradoxical or impossible about such a union.

9. In a very interesting paper Vigne (1975) discusses 'the degree of dependence of a child on parents and its social distance from them'. She does not discuss parental authority in general but limits herself to talking about ways parents distance themselves from their children. She suggests that the extent to which parents do so is less when parents are materially dependent on children, although she notes that the relationship between distance and dependence is not simple. The variety of patterns of distance and dependence discussed in this brief article illustrate the complexity to be coped with by any model.

10. A quarter of my working-class respondents were aware of a sibling who died as an infant or child. There were also, no doubt, deaths they were unaware of or did not report. For a discussion of the impact of child death on

working-class parents in this period see Vincent (1980, 1981).

11. For a discussion of working hours see Mowat(1968), Bain, Bacon and Pimlott(1972).

12. Hatty's maternal grandfather was a cooper. Sometimes he was away on a job for a long time; for example, he spent a long time in Dublin, installing Guinness vats. Her maternal grandmother would go with him and the rest of the family, Hatty's uncles, came to stay with her mother.

13. The pension was described by Martha as 25/- a week plus 3/- for her and 2/- a week each for the rest.

14. For documentation of children's games at this period see Walvin (1982, 1978) Opie (1969).

15. Electrification of significant numbers of domestic households did not take place in Britain before the 1930s. Although Hoover began to sell vacuum cleaners in Britain in 1919, it was only in the 1930s, with the construction of the National Grid and with the establishment of indigenous firms such as Morphy Richards(1936), that anything like a large market in domestic electrical devices emerged (Aspinwall, 1983; Hannah, 1979; Hughes, 1983).

16. This is based on information provided by my own respondents and also on the discussion of servants in Branca (1975), McBride (1976), Burnett (1977) and Taylor (1979).

17. Caroline's mother did give instructions to the governess. She insisted, for example, that they walk to school for the exercise, accompanied by the governess. She

would also occasionally organise summer picnics for Caroline and her visiting cousins. But Caroline described her as on the whole "too busy" with the County Council and the Queen's Nurses.

CHAPTER SIX

EXPERIENCED AS 'SEPARATED-OFF'?

One of the characteristic features of 'the modern family' which emerged from chapter two was its separateness. 'The modern family' is unto itself, 'separated-off' from the wider social world. The notion of the family as 'separated-off', as a discrete, bounded entity, is not a simple one. It refers to both a simple structural separation and an experiential separation. There is no question that families in the early 1900s were separated-off in the first sense. They were separate residential units: that is in most cases, parents and their children were the sole occupants of a dwelling. Also, for the majority of paid workers, home and paid employment were separated in place and time. But it is the second sense with which I am concerned. The authors discussed in chapter two are also referring to perceptions and practices which elaborate or overlay these structural separations. For example, authors assume the family is perceived as a qualitatively richer place than elsewhere, that effort is devoted to keeping the family in and the outside out. It is this aspect of the separation of the modern family that I discuss in this chapter.¹

There are three facets of this image of the separate, modern family to be found in the work of the major authors. I sharpen these by presenting them in the form of analogy. The analogies used by authors are often too ambiguous and

complex to simultaneously dramatise and clarify: for example 'haven in a heartless world' or Shorter's version 'warm shelter of domesticity from cold inhospitable night' (Shorter, 1977, 204) collapse two of the following analogies. The first two are common; the last is found principally in the work of Donzelot:

1. The family is an oasis in an emotional desert. 2. The family is a fortified castle able to protect its occupants from the hostile external world. 3. The family is a container which traps its members and makes them vulnerable to the interventions of powerful external agents.

The first suggests that beyond the family of father, mother and children there is an emotional desert, relatively devoid of other primary relations or, indeed, alternative sources of psychic satisfaction. This desert is created by the withering under the blast of change of older patterns of sociability and sources of psychological satisfaction.

The second suggests that members of the nuclear family, particularly the parents, actively build barricades around the family in protection against the outside world. Change has resulted in the outside world being perceived as a threatening environment with which contact must be limited and controlled.

Both of these characterisations of the separateness of the family are represented in the work of several of the authors discussed in chapter two. Aries, for example, sees

parents both as actively building barriers around the family to protect their children, and as being encouraged to retreat into their family for emotional support as the sociability of the old world recedes.

The third image, which is supplied by Donzelot, suggests that the working-class family in particular is a container which immobilises its members and thus renders them vulnerable to intervention by outside agents. Above all, the family is a convenient pigeon-hole for the delivery of State power. This is the result of successful middle-class efforts to 'impose' the family on the working class, but has involved cooperation by members of the working class. Lasch shares this image of the family, although he describes its development in very different terms. For Lasch, the middle-class family and the working-class family alike are invaded by external agents. Both classes have had their 'castles' reduced to traps.

It is this third view of the family, as a convenient pigeon-hole for the effective delivery of State power, to which I devote the most attention in this chapter. This is not because I regard the first two analogies as less worthy of discussion. Indeed, they must be discussed, but to a greater extent than with the third analogy, the previous chapter has laid much of the groundwork. I can therefore be relatively brief.

Once again I have to remind the reader that the material I am using consists of memories of growing up.

The family is seen through the eyes of the child as she or he moves through the ages of five to the early twenties.

The oasis and the desert

In the last chapter, I discussed the emotional intensity of parent/child relationships. Few respondents expressed no affection for their parents and/or felt no affection from them. However, many spent little of their free time with their parents. Their relationship was not emotionally intense to the extent that they frequently sought each other's company. Some children were, indeed, glad to avoid their parents because of their authoritarian style. Others were aware that their parents liked to avoid them. These factors combined make untenable the description of many families as emotionally intense.

The lack of emotional intensity of many families makes the analogy of the oasis in an emotional desert seem rather inappropriate. Theoretically, those respondents for whom the family was more of an emotional focus are more likely to experience a discontinuity between the emotional intensity of the family and the wider social world.

If the family is not always an oasis, it may be that the surrounding environment is not always a desert. Again, some relevant information from my respondents was provided in the previous chapter, where some description is given of how children and young people do spend their free time. Many are out of the house with their friends. However, friends are frequently locality and life-cycle specific. Few respondents maintained friendships from childhood into

young adulthood. Nevertheless, this does not mean that friends are a negligible source of emotional support at any one time. Unfortunately, the degree of support received from friends is not easy to measure and I am unable to comment generally on this.²

However, it is clear that for a few working-class children, because of their enforced integration into the responsibilities of the household, the family, rather than an oasis, was a harsh environment from which the world of childhood street play, and even school, was an escape. Mary, for example, said that she enjoyed the school but "as soon as we got home we got the fun knocked out of our heads".

There are, of course, other images of the family's environment which contradict that of the emotional desert. The image of the traditional working-class community, for example, is hardly one of an emotional desert, or of a hostile external world.

Indeed, the stereotypes of a traditional working-class community would suggest a way of life in which family boundaries were de-emphasised. The images that come to mind are those of all adults of the community feeling free to discipline all children without fear of offending their parents; constant exchanges of goods and services, for example, help for sick neighbours; constant sociable visiting of each others' houses.

I have not undertaken a community study, and can only

state that most of the respondents I interviewed did not live in such a community. Many respondents experienced various moves while growing up. Of those who lived in the same place throughout their childhood, some confirmed aspects of this view of community life. For example, Hatty talked about the role the neighbours played when her mother was out 'at work' fulltime.

"Before mother was out working she had done all her sewing and knitting on the back green and knew all the neighbours. When she was out working everyone knew, and people would keep an eye on you."(Hatty, born 1902, seaman's daughter)

The strongest expressssion of a sense of community came, spontaneously, from Nina. Her family were probably better off than many of their neighbours. They occupied one of the few four apartment flats in a stair dominated by 'room and kitchens'. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, Nina's family also used to spend more time together as a family than many other respondents. It is she who talks of evenings playing ludo and dominoes, as well as going to dances together as a family.

"Well you lived in a it was really a community you know. Your neighbours' doors were always open and you shared everything. My mum would make a pot of soup and one or two would get a bowl of soup out of it. And the chap on the top floor was a good baker and he used to bring the bread home sometimes ..." (Nina, born 1903, plumber's daughter)

The sense of community, and of integration of community and family, given in the previous and the following quotation should not be overstretched. Many respondents communicated a sense of reserve between families, a reluctance to intrude and a concern for

privacy. For example, children did not go into their friends' houses and neighbours were not 'in and out'.

Sociability between working-class families was more typically restricted to public space outwith the home. Nina's description of teenage social life does not contradict this. She divided activity into evenings at home with the family, as quoted in the previous chapter, and time outside with family, friends and neighbours. Time outside was spent on street games, long walks with groups of friends, church social evenings, dances, pictures.

"And we often used to make up wee surprise³ parties. I remember there was an empty house down in West Richmond Street. I was only 15 at the time when I said to my mother we want to have a wee surprise party down in the empty house. And we did have it and the neighbours all come in with different things. Well if you were doing that now they would probably call the police right away wouldn't they." (Nina, born 1903, plumber's daughter)

For Nina and many respondents the sense of community is based on a memory of these now less possible spontaneous events. The community she describes, however, although it contradicts the image of an emotional desert, is not engulfing the nuclear family to the extent that family melts into community. The family remains an emotional focus for Nina, more so than for many respondents.

Both sides of the view of the family as an oasis in an emotional desert require modifying. It overstates both the emotionally intense family relationships and the absence of relationships outwith the family. Examples from middle-class families could be used to reach a similar conclusion. I prefer to use such examples in the next section.

The fortified castle

Clearly, a strong sense of community is incompatible with a view of the world outside the immediate family as a hostile environment. However, not all respondents expressed a sense of community. In this section I ask whether parents in any way communicated a view of the world outwith the family as hostile or otherwise worthy of avoidance. Attempts by parents at limiting their children's contact with the outside world seem theoretically a hopeful starting point. It seems more likely that children who were more home and family oriented would regard the world beyond the family as threatening.

If children are regarded as innocent and fragile, then a hostile world is a particularly dangerous place for the child. In the previous chapter I said that working-class parents were less inclined to regard their children in this way. At this stage we might guess, therefore, that middle-class parents were more likely to portray the outside world as a hostile world.

A few working-class parents, however, did encourage their children to be home-based. These parents expressed an unease with leisure patterns that involved people and places beyond their ken. When I asked Amy if she had friends at school she replied:

"Yes, but you see we had such a big family that we didnae need any friends. Mother didnae like us to go about with strange, other girls. She preferred us all to go about together. Och but we a' had friends alright." (Amy, born 1894, foreman bookbinder's daughter)

Bessie's father tried to restrict her leisure activities to

those organised by the church.

"We never had the freedom of going out on our own, you know. We were always at church or church socials or something like that you know. ... Father didn't like me going in a crowd. He liked to know everyone." (Bessie, born 1896, sawmill foreman's daughter)

As a consequence, Bessie kept certain of her social activities from her father. These involved trips to the seaside and 'surprise parties' with people from her work place. She would say that she was 'going a walk'. As well as trying to discourage her from 'going in a crowd', her father encouraged her to bring friends home. He also spent an exceptional amount of time with her and her siblings.

"My father, there used to be a theatre at Stockbridge, and he took us to see 'Uncle Tom's Cabin' and he took us to see 'the King of Kings', different things. We never thought nothing about it. We just went. [What age were you then?] Later on, when I'd maybe be about eighteen. He was a great soul, my father."

Jean was identified in the last chapter as similarly having an unusually close relationship with her father. He used to take her round Edinburgh and taught her the history of different closes, and they visited the museum together regularly. She was brought up in a particular part of Edinburgh. Her parents were not geographically mobile. Her parents also encouraged her to bring friends to the house and communicated a sense of wariness about the outside world.

She was the oldest of the children and her parents sometimes left her to baby sit.

"They used to put the boys in bed and when they were asleep they would leave. And I was dumped in a big chair and brought round to the fire. My father would turn the chair

round to the fire and I'd have books put into my hand. [He said,] 'Now you can read this. And I want you to tell me what it's all about.' Well I knew he'd read all these so I had to read them. 'And whatever you do, don't answer the door.' That was one thing I got. And there was only once I did something which I felt was daft. The shows were in Iona St and it was one of the show women came to me and asked where there was a lavatory in the street. I took her up to the house. Of course my mother had to open the door. I got a lecture after that. 'Never bring anybody up to the house.' I never thought of refusing her." (Jean, born 1895, cabinet maker's daughter)

In all these cases, respondents come from better-off working-class families, the labour aristocracy. It may be that parents in better-off families had a more developed sense of 'the child' and sometimes a greater wariness of their neighbours. But again, since I am inferring attitudes from behaviour, these remarks are only tentative. In all these cases the respondents are also women. It is not clear whether the same wariness was communicated to their brothers. Gender differences are discussed in detail in chapter eight.

Whatever the reasons, however, discouraging children from 'going in a crowd', from bringing strangers up to the house and opening the door to anyone, all contribute to the creation of boundaries between the family and the rest of the world. The family is declared a more satisfactory and possibly a safer 'place' than the rest of the world.

Many of the restrictions parents placed on children do not do this. Take, for example, the dictum 'children should be seen and not heard'. It underlines the authority relationship within the family but does not accentuate family boundaries. It is possible, however, that any

restrictions placed on children that severely limit where they may go might accentuate family boundaries. This would occur if restrictions not only limited children's contact with the outside world but also generated an image of the forbidden territory as dangerous.

Many middle-class children were not allowed to play in the streets. Some middle-class daughters were rarely out alone, even as teenagers. Of the restrictions parents placed on children, these seem the most likely to contribute to a sense of being protected by the family from a threatening environment. But this is not necessarily how these restrictions were experienced by respondents. Nor, indeed, is it necessarily the spirit in which the restrictions were applied. I suggest that the restrictions placed on children were often more to do with marking class boundaries than with building barriers between the family and the outside world.

Liz is a possible exception. Liz's parents were white-collar workers. Her father died when she was four and her mother came to Edinburgh to take charge of a sub post-office. The only 'help' in the house was a woman who came once a week to do the washing and another once a week to do the heavy cleaning. She saw the restrictions placed on her as part of a package of efforts her mother made to bring her up under difficult circumstances.

"Again, my mother was very strict about us not being allowed out to play in the street or anything like that and did believe in children going to bed early. And it did coincide with her post office activities because she saw myself and my brother were in bed by six, six thirty, [up

to age seven] before she went back to do her final duties in the office up till nine o'clock ... [When aged ten - twelve] It was a question of you did your school work. You got a lot in those days. You had to do that first then you could play, usually quiet games, board games, and often family chat."

The only time she went out to play was Saturday morning when her brother took her to the park where he met his friends to play cricket and football.

"I had two sets of friends, because the [private] school I went to, from when I was nine onwards, was right on the other side of the town. As I was too young to see the school friends out of school hours, I didn't know them except in school. But I knew people locally where I lived who had been at the school I had first been at. My mother very much encouraged us having friends in the house and, rather than we were allowed to go to other people's houses, she preferred to know what we were up to, where we were. And we could ask half a dozen children in our own age to spend a Saturday afternoon and evening and that sort of thing. It was an open door we could always ask our little friends into." (Liz, born 1899, telegraph superintendant's daughter)

This pattern of having friends round rather than going to friends' houses could only work provided other parents were not as anxious as her mother. Clearly what was communicated to Liz, and also Amy and Bessie among the working-class respondents, was a sense that her parent, because of the parent's view of a good upbringing, always wanted to know where she was. In Liz's case this resulted in an exceptionally home-centred existence.

This pattern of parents always wanting to know exactly where their children were did not necessarily lead to a negative view of the world beyond the family. Indeed, Bessie deceived her father because his views were out of tune with the pattern of sociability common among young

women at her work-place. Liz was more accepting of her mother's definition of a good upbringing, but she successfully imported friends into the family.

Bessie was, of course, not the only child to regard her parent's view of the world as slightly quirky. The heterogeneity of the middle class meant that children and young people were often aware of other styles of parenting. Grace, for example, was supervised by a nurse until she was 13 or 14. She was never allowed to play in the street, or to be boisterous in any way. Wherever she went she had always to wear a hat, even playing in the garden. She knew she was not the only girl treated like this but, she also knew that other girls who went to the same school had much more freedom.

"Some of my friends were totally different. I always envied some of my friends because they were allowed to run on roads alone." (Grace, born 189?, owner/manager's daughter, pharmaceuticals)

Emily was born slightly earlier, and, by her own definition, a member of a more homogeneous upper middle class.

"Our difficulty was being so hard up, and belonging to the, I suppose you would call it, upper middle class. I mean we were educated, sent to proper schools, and went to nice parties. Our friends were all quite rich and grand in their way."

She took it for granted as simply the way things were done that she would not go anywhere alone as a young woman.

"I never went about alone then. You didn't go about alone and never came home alone. My father always came for us if we were at friends' houses in the evening. But, of course, that was the generation." (Emily, born 1888, stockbroker's daughter)

Sometimes parents made explicit to their children that they were not to do certain things because they were not in the same (undesirable) category as those who did them. Elizabeth's friend, for example, gave her this explanation of why she never went for a walk on Sunday.

"Oh, my mother says, 'It is only the low-class people who go for walks on Sundays.' Our maid goes."

Perhaps more often, activities were dismissed by an unexplained designation as "unsuitable". Nevertheless, this term communicated something of the same message.

I would argue that the close supervision of many children, particularly middle-class children, did not necessarily lead to or spring from a sense of the family as protecting children from the world beyond. Rather it was understood in terms of 'good living', 'good breeding', and 'good upbringing'. What this meant was class specific and part and parcel of the process of maintaining class boundaries. Thus, I suspect that parents who forbade their children to play in the street were often saying 'we are not the class of people who play in the streets', rather than 'the streets are dangerous and you are better at home'.

This view is supported by the fact that middle-class parents often encouraged their children to be very sociable, but in particular ways. Although middle-class children were often closely supervised or channeled into 'appropriate' formal, organised leisure, they were not restricted to the home. The most strictly supervised

respondents were also involved in an age specific world of middle-class sociability.

Is it similarly possible to argue that those working-class parents who didn't like their daughters 'going in a crowd' were maintaining class boundaries by their restrictions rather than building family boundaries? In their case the restriction, if effective, turned the child more directly back on the family. Beyond the home and family activities, there was, because of the nature of the restriction, a very limited range of ways of spending time acceptable to the parent.

Neither oasis nor fortified castle

Families are separated-off from the wider social world in many respects. This was true in the early 1900s. They are not only separate residential units but, even in cases where there was a strong sense of community, they are not completely 'open door'. Eck, for example, said that you could go into anybody's house in the row of mining cottages where he lived. When I investigated further it emerged that he never had a meal in anyone else's house, and would not visit at meal times.

The discussion above illustrates that parents typically controlled who and when children could bring people into the house. Liz's house, for example, was an 'open door' in so far as her mother had declared it so. That is, she could have up to a dozen friends her own age round on Saturday afternoons and evenings.

None of the respondents came close to regarding the family or their family home as an oasis in a desert or a fortified castle in a threatening world. Those respondents who were most home-centred or most emotionally focused on the family were no more likely to see the world beyond the family as devoid of comfort. Liz was encouraged to be home-centred by bringing the outside world, in the form of her friends, home. Thus opposition between family and the outside world was reduced. The family was an obvious emotional focus for Nina, and yet she had a strong sense of her family's integration into a community. The opposition expressed by Bessie's and Amy's parents between 'family' and 'crowd', 'family' and 'strange girls' was not an expression of a pervasive view.

The container and the intervening State

I now wish to turn to the view of the working-class family expressed in the work of Donzelot. Donzelot suggests that 'the middle class', particularly through State agents, attempted to 'impose' an emotionally intense 'separated-off' family on the working class. Moreover, working-class parents 'cooperated' with State agents to contain their children in the family.

In chapter four I briefly reviewed the development of State intervention in the family, referring to legislation passed and the opinions of the legislators. The apparent determination of legislators to keep children off the streets and at home or in school lends weight to Donzelot's case. Documentation of the actual workings of the

legislation, which is discussed below, seems to add further to the image of the imposition of childhood on children and the policing of their families.

Subsequently, in this section, through my respondents, I look for the impact of the legislation in practice and in spirit on working-class children and their parents.

The documentary evidence, laws and parliamentary reports; suggests a formidable network of ways of interfering in the family. Procedures for summoning the parents of children failing to attend school were established in 1883.⁴ Attendance officers, created to investigate non-attenders, were attached to school boards. Their remit was to visit and investigate a family whose child was not attending school.

Another Scottish Education Act of 1908 made it the duty of the School Board to act in the case of any child who was found to be filthy, verminous or lacking adequate food or clothing. In such a case, again, the SchoolBoard was to summons either or both parents to explain the condition of the child. If not satisfied with the parents' response the Board could alert the Procurator Fiscal and the case could proceed through the courts under the Prevention of Cruelty legislation.

The ultimate sanction embedded in the legislation was the removal of children from the home. Various pieces of legislation established the conditions under which this could be done. The Prevention of Cruelty legislation

provided for the defining of parents as 'unfit' and then the removal of children and their disposal to some other 'fit' person. Children could also be defined as 'beyond the control of their parents' and thus requiring new management. Such children could be committed to a residential Industrial School.⁵

The tendency of authorities to see neglected and delinquent children as one and the same is often cited as evidence of the 'real' purpose of the legislation (Gillis, 1974,). The belief that neglected and delinquent children had the same aetiology and required the same reformatory treatment resulted in the committal of both to long, harsh regimes in the same institutions.

There was overlap between the 19th and early 20th century Prevention of Cruelty legislation and the Industrial Schools legislation. Children found begging or wandering could be committed to Industrial School under that legislation and their parent proceeded against under the Prevention of Cruelty legislation. Similarly, destitute children with their parents in prison, children of parents with criminal or drunken habits, and children in the company of thieves or prostitutes or residing in a brothel could be sent to Industrial School.

How often this ultimate sanction, of removing the child, was actually used can be seen by the tables of admissions to Industrial School and of children held there.

**Average Annual Admissions to Industrial Schools, Scotland,
1861-1915**

Year (5yr. average)	Boys	Girls
1861-1865	237	121
1866-1870	597	223
1871-1875	694	223
1876-1880	821	270
1881-1885	758	212
1886-1890	841	225
1891-1895	949	260
1896-1900	792	244
1901-1905	707	261
1906-1910	641	265
1911-1915	620	263
1921-1925	381	

**Number of children detained in Industrial Schools,
Scotland, selected years**

Year	Boys	Girls
1900	3,581	1,457
1905	3,198	1,335
1910	3,044	1,436
1915	2,649	1,306
1925	1,178	596

Source: Judicial Statistics Scotland, selected years.

The numbers are not large as a proportion of the school age population, although, of course, this does not preclude the possibility of a considerable degree of everyday State interference in working-class families. The number of committals and committed fell off markedly after the First World War. In particular, the number of boys committed for 'wandering' declines. This was the largest category of 'neglected' children shown in the table below. The fall in this category raises the question of how

'wandering' was used in the earlier period.

**Percentage Distributions of Committals to Industrial School
by Reason for Committal, Scotland, Selected Years**

Year	Neglected ^a		Child Offenders ^b		Truants ^c		Number=100%	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
1900	87	90	10	7	3	1	741	197
1905	85	94	12	5	3	1	706	284
1910	72	84	26	16	2	1	509	279
1915	48	81	49	16	3	4	672	245
1920	50	87	48	11	2	2	375	205
1925	40	89	49	10	11	1	368	153

a. Children found either begging, wandering, destitute, in the company of thieves or prostitutes, residing in a brothel or, after 1908, with parents of criminal or drunken habits or with a father who was a sexual offender. That is in any condition listed under section 58, 1 of the 1908 Children's Act.

b. Children under twelve charged with an offence which in the case of an adult is punishable by penal servitude or a lesser punishment; children whose parents being unable to control their child wish his or her committal to Industrial School; refractory poorhouse children; also, after 1908, children between twelve and 14 charged with an offence.

c. All children committed because of a contravention of Education Acts and bye-laws concerning street trading or other employment; children transferred from Day Industrial Schools because of non-attendance or bad behaviour.

Source: Judicial Statistics Scotland, Selected Years.

The actual working of the legislation was subject to debate precisely because of the drastic nature of the sanction. From reports of committees of 1896 and 1914-16,⁶

it can be established that most of the committals were instigated either by an officer of the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children or by the school authorities. These two agents accounted for slightly less than half the committals each. The small remainder were principally cases brought by a police officer.

It seems that the way the Prevention of Cruelty legislation operated gave considerable power to the voluntary N.S.P.C.C.'s⁷ officers. Descriptions of their operations sometimes foster an image of the N.S.P.C.C. as child-catchers. A witness to the Departmental Committee established in 1895 to investigate Industrial and Reformatory Schools commented on the work of the N.S.P.C.C. in Glasgow as follows: 'Their officers go about the city, I believe, in the evening. If they find any specially neglected boy, say on the stairs, or among boys older than himself, and likely to lead to crime, they pounce and take him to their shelter, and make further inquiry. If they are satisfied they bring the boy before the police court.' (**Report of the Departmental Committee on Reformatory and Industrial Schools**, Vol 2, Evidence and Index, 1897, 42, London, HMSO, cd 8290)

The 1896 committee report contains, in an appendix, a memorandum from the chairman of the Scottish N.S.P.C.C. describing the cases of 22 children committed to Industrial schools. These are presented as evidence against accusations of indiscriminate committal by the N.S.P.C.C.,⁸

accusations that had arisen because of the higher rate of committal in Scotland than in England. In most of these cases, including children referred to as 'wandering', the parents were described as having failed to provide adequate food and clothing, often also being accused of either cruelty, drunkenness or causing children to beg.

The term 'wandering' was used of children found on the streets, particularly if late at night. The cause of wandering was usually cited as being that the child had been turned out of the house or was beyond the control of parents. From the brief descriptions of cases of children brought before the courts in the 1914-16 report, it would appear that wandering was used similarly then.

This additional information, although obviously fairly superficial, does not eradicate the image of N.S.P.C.C. as sweeping up children not safely contained in their family.

The school authorities were also asked by both committees to defend their practice and something of their operation was revealed in the process. Concern was expressed that truants had been and might be committed to Industrial Schools for a full term of committal. It was suspected that this was done, prior to 1893, by committing them, not as truants under the Education Acts, but under the category 'wandering' of the Industrial School Acts. This practice was stopped in 1893 by a request from the Crown Agent for specific information about the grounds of committal to be supplied for each case.

After 1893, if committal to an Industrial School was

sought then the practice was to have parents plead that their child was beyond their control. In terms of the letter of the law parents had to wish for the committal to occur. Witnesses were questioned about whether the parents did indeed always want committal to take place. The answers were not entirely affirmative. There was no evidence to suggest that children were ever committed for single acts of truancy, but the image persisted of school authorities and courts bullying parents into the committal of their children.

The image of teams of attendance officers that is given in the reports certainly suggests effective family supervision. The Chief Attendance Officer of the School Board of Glasgow, John MacDonald, described his team to the 1914 committee: 'For ordinary visiting purposes in connection with day schools - officers are divided into two classes, known as 'district' and 'default'. There are 45 districts and seven defaults. Each officer has a district assigned to him. District officers deal with absentees reported from the schools every week. They are also responsible for ... enrolment ... Default officers deal with the cases the district officers cannot get to attend school regularly ... It is the duty of the whole staff to report to me cases in which children are being neglected and are know to be living in immoral surroundings.'

(Evidence Taken by the Departmental Committee on Reformatory and Industrial Schools in Scotland (with

Appendices), 1915, London, HMSO, cd 7887, 'Precis of Evidence to be given by Mr John McDonald, the Chief Attendance Officer of the School Board of Glasgow', 279-280)

It is of course possible that Mr MacDonald's team was exceptionally well organised and that other cities were less well covered. Also, of course, in practice, his team may not have been as effective as the description suggests. But the impression given is of an effective surveillance force.

I now wish to turn to my respondents and to ask to what extent they were aware of State agents supervising them and their families. I also wish to know what attitude, if any, their parents communicated with regard to the various State agents, 'the authorities', teachers, medical officers, attendance officers, police, court officials. Again, my remarks have to be tentative. I did not systematically ask respondents about contact with each of these. The only relevant topics I included in my interview guide concerned truancy and part-time work while at school. Trouble with police typically emerged while discussing play and free time.

With the limitations of the data in mind, references to N.S.P.C.C. officers, police officers and attendance officers are discussed as evidence of their impact on the working-class family. At the same time I look for examples of the parent expressing an attitude to the child. After the testimony of the witness to the 1895 committee,

quoted above, it might be anticipated that every working-class child would be aware of the existence of N.S.P.C.C. officers if not on familiar terms with her or his local officer. Only one account made reference to the organisation. This respondent's mother was beating her two sons in the back green with a belt. The back green was overlooked by 'big houses' and someone sent the N.S.P.C.C. man round to check that her mother was not using the buckle end of the belt. This event did not seem to cause any particular anger or resentment.

It is surprising that this is the only incident ever recounted in which an N.S.P.C.C. officer is mentioned. The majority of my respondents were not brought up in Glasgow, and it is possible that the patrolling tactics of the N.S.P.C.C. were not adopted everywhere.

On the other hand, police officers were referred to by a number of respondents. Children playing in the street were frequently chased away by a policeman. I have not referred to Police Acts when discussing age-specific legislation, since they did not name a particular age group. Many of the activities listed as forbidden in the street read as if they were specifically designed with children in mind. Playing football, skipping ropes and similar games in the street were offences against these acts.

Some respondents were actually fined. This, of course, involved interaction between police and parents with

consequences for subsequent interaction between parent and child. For example, Wattie was fined 2/6d for playing football in the street. His father was a scavenger earning 15/- a week. It is interesting that the disgrace of the event seems to have been as important as the financial penalty.

"In these days if the police came to your door you wouldnae get beyond that door for God knows how long." (Wattie, born 1898, scavenger's son)

Belle's mother had a similar reaction when her brother kicked in a window playing football.

"Oh, my mother thought it was a terrible disgrace! My mother had to go then to pay 7/6d for breaking a window. But he never played football in the street again. You learn." (Belle, born 1900, shoemaker's daughter)

Belle was chased herself by their local policeman, nicknamed Tankerbelly, for playing skipping ropes in the street. Here she describes her mother's reaction when she complains to her.

"'Oh, mother, my ear's so sore! Tankerbelly gave me such a wallop with his glove!' You know I got a bigger wallop from my mother. 'You were told not to play in the street. Do what you are told.'"

The picture which emerges is one of parents who respect the authority of the police, including the right of the police to beat their children. Here is one respondent's account of police treatment.

"The police were very strict in these days and brutal. They would think nothing of taking you into a stair. And they used to wear these heavy waist belts around their tunic. And you knew when they got you by the back of the neck and took you into a stair what you were in for." (George, born 1900, foreman porter's son)

Although parents were prepared to back police

authority in some sense, few parents made any real effort to stop children playing in the street. It was probably only typical to stress to children that they must not play football in the street, for example, after disaster had struck in the form of a fine.

There were exceptions, however. George's father would look at his boots when he came in and give him a row if they suggested he'd been playing football. George was one of several working-class children who were not allowed out to play in winter. It may be that there was a significant minority of working-class parents attempting to contain their children's street play along lines more in tune with the authorities.

My respondents did not have stories to tell about attendance officers. The majority attended school faithfully. But those who did not were not plagued by them, except for Tom's parents described below.

There were a few respondents who were kept off school by their parents. They were mainly girls kept at home to do domestic work. Maggie, for example, said that she was more often absent than at the school because she was helping in the house. Nancy attended three schools as her father moved from pit to pit, in Stirlingshire and then Midlothian. She was often at home helping her mother rather than school. Her "birth lines" were lost in the moves and despite her poor attendance record the headmaster gave her a "recommendation" stating her age, and testifying to her good attendance and punctuality.

Children whose parents ran small labour-intensive and under-resourced business were also kept off. Bill was left alone in his father's butcher shop at the age of twelve.

"Name of goodness, twelve years of age I was alone in the shop. My mother ... at that age she was becoming very ill ... in fact she died in the Infirmary before I was twelve years of age. So you see with having to work early and knowing what to do you were forced into the position. My father, he'd be away to the market on the Monday. That was a whole day and I'd be alone there... Oh, yes, I left school before 14. I mean I only went occasionally back to school between twelve and 14. I was required in the shop. I never went to night school. I hadn't the time to go with the long hours you had to work, you know."

These and several other accounts suggest it was relatively easy to stay off school without official interference. They suggest that the authorities were often prepared to turn a blind eye to what has been termed 'subsistence truancy' (Witherington, 1975; Humphries, 1981).

Few respondents admitted to 'skiving', 'skipping' or 'kipping the school', taking days off for their own purposes. On the whole, parents, teachers and pupils seemed to share an abhorrence of this form of truancy.

The following example illustrates the reaction of Annie's mother and teacher to her taking the afternoon off school. A girl who lived in the next stair to Annie had died and her class had been given the day off for the funeral. Annie was not in her class but decided to take the afternoon off to see the funeral. She met her mother who asked her why she was not at the school. Her mother said that she wouldn't punish her herself but that she was

not to come crying to her when she got punished at school. The next day at school she was belted for taking the afternoon off.

Annie's mother's reaction was gentle in comparison to Tom's father's. One day he came home from school to find his father waiting for him with his pit belt in his hand.

"He leathered into me and my mother darenae come in between us or he would have given it to her. He leathered me until I couldnae move. This was the teacher had sent him a note saying I had kipped the school. I was a devil at the school but I had never kipped in my life. He swore he would be there the next day to see if I was telling a lie. I forgot all about it until I saw my father at the school the next day ... checked the register and it was another Smith." (Tom, born 1897, miner's son)

The one account of persistent truancy did not result in effective intervention on behalf of the school authorities, although they did have their impact. Eck told me how his brother played truant for a whole year. It is not clear why he did not simply seek an exemption from school. Possibly his father was not willing.

"Joe, he skipped the school for a whole year. I'll tell you the reason though, he was that big. He was six feet when he was at the school. And he was the top of the class. He couldnae go any higher in the school like. He decided not to bother going. Well my father went on the ham and egg shift, that is nine o'clock start in the morning, just to take him to school ... whenever we came to [near the school] Joe was away ... and my father couldnae catch him nor nothing like catch him. Well that went on for a year. And the school authorities was at my father. You see the janitor was doon [at the house] every day about him ... There was a wee shop ... I opened the shutters in the morning for that woman who worked the shop, ... well here he's [Joe] lying up the top o' this, it's a flat roof, and when he sees me passing he shouts oot 'See and bring me six slices of breid or I'll knock your bloody heid off.' And there I had to go round to the hoose and mouch my way in, you ken, and go to the press, and try and slip oot someway with the breid, and fling it up to him in a bag. Aye. Oh, he would have murdered me if I hadnae doneit, like. And this is how he was living. I don'know how he

did it. Slept out all night and that went on for a year. Skipped the school for a year like." (Eck, born 1901, miner's son)

Joe slept rough in order to escape both the school authorities and his father. He worked with a coal merchant during the day and succeeded in evading them both for the school year.

Of the three types of officers, the 'cruelty man', the police and the school attendance officer⁹, only the police were an everyday presence to be reckoned with in the case of several respondents. Those who played in streets policed by men like Tankerbelly had to be on the look out, if they were to avoid not only punishment from the policeman but also at home.

The support of parents for authority was pervasive. For example, although a 'success' story in terms of the evasion of school, Eck's tale of Joe still illustrates parents' willingness to back that authority.

This is confirmed by many accounts of parents' attitudes to teachers' use of corporal punishment. If parents knew that their child had been belted in school the typical response was one of lack of sympathy and verbal affirmation of the teacher's authority, 'you must have deserved it', or a physical supplementing of the teacher's authority by belting the child for being belted.

For example, just as Belle's mother hit her when Tankerbelly hit her so she hit her when the teacher hit her. Belle was belted in school for talking. Her friend told her mother with good intentions. The full story was

that Belle only talked because she needed glasses and could not see the blackboard. However, when her mother asked why she had been punished, Belle replied for talking. She got a hard smack from her mother with a wet hand and told she went to school to learn not to talk. Mickey commented: "There was always someone in the miners' rows told your mother [you'd got the belt] so that you got another doing when you got home." Other respondents commented that you would never dream of going home and telling your parents you had been belted because you knew that you would be in more trouble. (Interestingly enough, middle-class boys made similar observations.)

It is important to ask whether parental support for 'the authorities' was part and parcel of an active effort by parents to contain their children. To what extent did they act on the view that children should be at home or in school, and thus constantly supervised and disciplined? To what extent can it be inferred that parents were in support of the spirit of the legislation and therefore striving to contain their children at home?

Again, because of the nature of the data, remarks about the attitudes of parents can only be very tentative. The willingness of parents to accept and back up the sanctions of teachers could reflect a view of children as not only 'naturally' subordinate to adults, but also as needing constant discipline. On the other hand, it may be that parents felt compelled to back up teachers lest they

themselves should appear a weaker and lesser authority. Also it may be that parents felt implicated if their child was punished at school.

I have already noted that all working-class parents demanded their children be home at a certain time of night. This was true for the majority even into their late teens and early twenties. A few parents insistently wanted to know exactly where their children were and expressed wariness of unknown people and places (see quotes from Amy and Bessie earlier in this chapter). But many were content with a much vaguer knowledge.

Although prepared to back the authority of teachers and abhorring truancy, parents were not typically reluctant to use legal means of withdrawing their children from school. No less than a fifth of the respondents left school at 13, the vast majority of them having obtained a certificate of exemption. For example, Tom's father got him an exemption at 13, which suggests that the aspect of the thought of Tom playing truant which enraged him was the disregard for authority rather than the disregard for education.

Thus, although placing limits, sometimes severe time limits and financial restrictions, on the freedom and independence of their children, working-class parents did not typically prohibit other activities which took children into the adult world. Parents did not object to their children's part-time jobs and were unabashed by taking them away from school early. This indicates that they did not

endorse the complete separation of childhood and adulthood that was an integral aspect of the spirit of the legislation.

This behaviour contradicts the idea of 'the child' as needing special protection, but it does not contradict a view of children as needing supervision and discipline. Work was typically a highly structured context characterised by supervision and discipline.

Legislation concerned to restrict part-time work did not have an obvious impact on the lives of respondents. Their part-time employment as school children was typically within the legally permitted limits.¹⁰ The majority of respondents were ten when they started part-time employment and worked within the permitted three to four hours a day. For example, the most common job, delivering milk, involved school children in work from six to eight am and sometimes also from four to five pm after school. The few respondents who worked longer hours did not seem to fear the regulations. Of course, there were no regulations governing the domestic work of school-children. Several girls clearly did more than four hours of housework a day, and a few respondents combined a daily portion of housework and a part-time job. Thus the out-of-school hours for a minority of children were, despite the regulations, spent either working or sleeping.

It has already been noted in chapter five that parents did not typically push their children into part-time

employment, and, at the same time, did not typically express reservations about it. There were a few of the respondents' parents who did express reservations, however. And although many respondents with part-time jobs were not from families in dire financial straits, in some households this was the only justification for children working.

Hugh delivered milk until the family decided that he should not do it. The impetus for the decision came from his elder brothers.

"They thought that I being the younger I shouldn't do that, you know. Especially my oldest brother. He started working in 'The Scotsman', you see and they were pretty well paid above the ordinary working man, 'The Scotsman' newspaper at that time." (Hugh, born 1906, house painter's son)

It was accepted by the family that Hugh should deliver milk only if the family needed the money. The family did not need the money and so he was not to do it. Belle delivered milk. She did not feel that her parents had bullied her into it but explained that her friend did not go because "her mother didnae need the money".

Another example of a family member expressing unease at a child's employment is that of Tilly's mother, who clearly wanted to distance herself from the fact that her daughter delivered milk. Tilly had been asked whether she "go with the milk" by a girl at school. "And I remember when I used to go my mother would say, 'remember I didn't ask you to go there'." (Tilly, born 1890, brass finisher's daughter) It is as if her mother was aware of the stereotype of the bad working-class parent who exploits the

child which lay behind much of the legislation.

As in other parts of Britain (Roberts, 1975) the selling of newspapers was stigmatised, at least among the 'labour aristocracy'. Jean describes a Saturday dinner time (midday) when her father came home to announce he had been laid off.

"He always used to lay down his envelope with his wages at mother's plate. And he said, 'That'll be the last for goodness knows how long.' And he said to me, 'You'll have to go out and sell "Newses".' I looked at him and I thought, this is a terrible thing for my father to suggest, that I should sell newspapers, because they were all rough boys that sold them at the end of Iona St. However, it never came to that. ... If we had we would have been down to rock bottom." (Jean, born 1895, cabinetmaker's daughter)

If, then, there were a few parents of respondents who had part-time jobs expressing disquiet, it might be expected that a greater number of parents of children who did not have part-time jobs were opposed to the idea of part-time work. However, not all respondents were clear as to why they did not have part-time 'work'. Some girls did not have part-time employment because they were already working long hours in domestic labour. Only Angus was clear that he did not have a job because his mother did not approve.

"My mother was very much against it. You had no time. If you were going to school you must learn."

Angus explained that his mother had been kept at school until she was 14 by her father¹¹ and had a keen sense of the value of education. Angus was one of only four working-class respondents who stayed on at school after 14. He did an intermediate certificate taking him beyond the

age of 15.

These examples do not contradict the overall picture that the majority of working-class parents were indifferent to or approving of part-time work by their children.¹² For example, most parents did not feel perturbed at the idea of their child getting up at half past five to deliver milk. But there is evidence to suggest that some parents felt children should only 'work' if circumstances would not permit otherwise.

I cannot say conclusively why some parents adopted this view. It may be that some working-class parents, like Tilly's mother, took to heart the middle-class stereotype of the bad working-class parent. It is possible that some parents took a pride in the fact that their children did not have to work. This is a logical extension of the ideology of the male breadwinner supporting the family.¹³ From this standpoint, women and children who work are 'forced' to do so because of the failure of the breadwinner. This seems to be the position from which Jean's father 'joked' about her selling newspapers. It is also possible that some parents, like Angus's mother, were increasingly regarding their children as needing protection from the adult world.

Contained or not

The idea of the family as a container and pigeon-hole for the delivery of State power, suggests both constant, vigilant supervision of children by parents, or their substitutes, and similarly vigilant supervision of children

by the 'super parent' the State. The State enters the picture at both the level of providing parent substitutes , the principal person in loco parentis being the teacher, and at the level of 'super parent'.

Most working-class children had chunks of unsupervised time between home and school. In some cases, these could be described as a period of escape, since many were subjected to severe discipline in both arenas. As noted in the previous chapter, it was not unusual for children to maximise the time they spent 'outside'. Escape or not, their time out was limited and the limits were established by parents. In this narrow sense, they were contained in the family.

After discussing the universal demand that children be home by a particular time of night, Roberts (1975,20) confidently concludes: 'Parents were concerned with younger children developing habits of vandalism and theft and with older children falling into moral danger.' In her view, then, working-class parents are indeed motivated to contain their children in the family, away from the temptations of the outside world. I am less confident that there is sufficient evidence to clearly specify the predominant attitudes of working-class parents to their children. My reading of the evidence suggests that working-class parents did not generally assume that their children were in constant moral danger, although they believed older girls needed more watching than boys.

That is not to say I think working-class parents were wholly unconcerned with such matters. Many respondents reported their parents' distaste for two 'morally dangerous' activities, drinking and gambling. Some girls were elliptically warned not to have sexual intercourse; they were told "keep away from the laddies", without further explanation, when they started menstruation. Some respondents spontaneously expressed the view that any form of theft or vandalism would result in their parents "murdering them". But, then, parents were prepared to send children of ten or twelve on errands which took them to workplaces and to other remote parts of town; they allowed them to earn money doing part-time and casual work, the dominant form, delivering, again involved being out and about the town; and few parents tried to restrict or monitor their children's movements in the summer evenings between tea and bedtime. This behaviour does not fit with a view of parents as constantly anxious about the corruptibility of their children.

I suggest that the motives behind 'having to be in' cannot be reduced to fears concerning children's susceptibility to moral danger. Explicit house rules which had to be obeyed were routine assertions of the hierarchy between parents and children. 'Having to be in' was the most pervasive such rule. Many respondents, both men and women, never had a key to their parents' house and were, therefore, routinely reminded who the 'gate-keepers' were.

It is possible, then, that working-class parents were

not primarily motivated to contain their children in the family away from the temptations of the street when they imposed curfews, although this was no doubt a factor. Moreover, the State as a 'super parent' was not constantly looming large in the background. The age-specific legislation discussed¹⁴ was not perceived as resulting in frequent extraordinary interference in the family.

But the vast majority of children did attend school reasonably regularly. They were only removed from school by parents to do work, either directly servicing the family through domestic work or by entering another formal setting, a workplace. Teachers and parents cooperated to a degree. Parents frequently took the opportunity to back up the authority of teachers.¹⁵ Teachers did not typically challenge the 'subsistence truancy' of children between twelve and 14.

Parents also backed the authority of the police, although few made real efforts to keep their children off the streets. The willingness of the police to enforce regulations against street play may have had considerable impact on some working-class families. Parents were made accountable for the actions of their children, through the payment of fines and through the obligation to explain. They were implicated and, in some cases, shamed by the appearance of the policeman at the door. Such an experience, or its threat, may have provided impetus to keep children at home.

The image of a container implies difficulty leaving. Unlike the other images, oasis and castle, an unpleasant external world is not given as the reason for staying at home. Rather it is parents who keep children at home. A few working-class parents successfully did this for most of their children's free time. All did so to a degree. The question of what keeps children at home is posed again in the next chapter in the context of a discussion of individualism.

1. There are, of course, other senses in which the family was 'separated-off' which I do not discuss. I believe the only serious omission in terms of the authors is a discussion of the extent to which the family was separated-off from wider kin, not just physically but in terms of loyalties and feelings. This is one of the aspects of 'separated-offness' stressed by Parsons. I believe my respondents' families were, on the whole, separated from wider kin in this sense and I summarise my evidence below.

They were certainly, on the whole, separated-off from wider kin in the sense of a physically separate residential unit. The exceptions, excluding step-parents and step-siblings, were as follows: among working-class respondents Martha's household contained a set of cousins after the War, Joe's grandmother "had the parlour" in his house, Hatty's household sometimes contained her mother's brothers; among the middle-class respondents, Catherine's grandmother lived with them, and Dorothy's household contained her father's cousin, who did dressmaking from home.

Although I did not systematically ask if respondents had relatives close by, or how often they were seen, any regular contact with relatives would normally have emerged during the interview. About half of respondents talked about relatives beyond their immediate family in the course of the interview. Among working-class respondents about a third talked of grandparents and about a third talked of aunts and uncles. Rather fewer middle-class respondents

mentioned grandparents. In less than half of the cases in which relatives were mentioned did respondents have regular and frequent contact with them.

Those who had the most contact with grandparents or a grandparent, excepting Joe and Catherine, were as follows: Andrew who took 'a turn', with other brothers and sisters, at staying with his grandparents - "so that mother could maybe give her [grandmother] 2/6d and get some food for her"- Barbara, Belle and Bob each lived virtually next door to their grandmothers and were often in their-house. A few other respondents, like Eck, and Molly and Dot visited their grandparents regularly, usually on Sunday. A few working-class respondents remember specific assistance from their grandmother. Wattie remembered that his mother's mother attended his mother's births. Jessie's grannie came to stay after her mother died and Amy's came when her mother was ill. For some respondents a grandparent was someone they were aware of but had no contact with, even when they lived in the same town. Ina's only visit to her father's mother, for example, was when her father died and she went to tell his mother. And of course, many never knew their grandparents because they were dead or otherwise remote.

About a third of respondents had contact with some aunts and uncles, being visited or visiting. Some respondents from both working-class and middle-class households had holidays in aunts' and uncles' houses. Some

middle-class children spent substantial periods in aunt's and uncle's houses. Emily, for example, spent a year in London with her aunt and uncle and Caroline had cousins staying for long periods during the summer. Again a few working-class respondents remembered specific help from an aunt or uncle. Bert's uncle got him an apprenticeship. Agnes sometimes got clothes from her aunt after her mother died. Just as Martha's mother "took in" her cousins when their mother died, so Eileen, Jessie's older sister and Sandy, similarly, went to stay with an aunt after their mothers died.

Thus wider kin, particularly grandmothers and mother's sisters among working-class respondents, were sometimes important in respondents' lives. But this sort of evidence does not add up to a refutation of Parsons characterisation of 'the modern family' as relatively structurally isolated from wider kin. However, Parsons also believes the family is 'separated-off' in other senses which are more open to question.

2. I do not believe it is impossible to operationalise 'emotional support' and gather information on this aspect of friendship. However, I did not do so at the critical stage in the study.

3. A 'surprise party' takes place at a pre-arranged venue and involves all the participants in bringing food or a beverage.

4. 1883 Education (Scotland) Act.

5. Industrial Schools were so named because they were

originally intended to give working-class children a training in industry. However, from the beginning, the residential schools had a penal character and, although throughout the period there were those who argued to the contrary, they were gradually made indistinguishable from Reformatory Schools devised for young offenders.

6. **The Report of the Departmental Committee on Reformatory and Industrial Schools**, Vol 1 Report and Appendices, 1896, 45, London, HMSO, cd 8204 and the **Report of the Departmental Committee on Reformatory and Industrial Schools in Scotland**, 1914-1916, 34, London, HMSO, cd 7887.

7. They could effect the removal of children from their parents by bringing the child to court where the child might be committed to an Industrial School or disposed of by entrustment to some other fit person. (Sometimes the matron of an industrial school was treated as a 'fit person' in order to thus dispose of children not otherwise qualifying for committal to Industrial School.)

8. This concern about higher rates of committal was not specifically directed at the N.S.P.C.C. **The Report of the Departmental Committee on Reformatory and Industrial Schools**, Vol 1, Report and Appendices, 1896, 45, London, HMSO, cd 8204 had a section entitled 'Lax Administration of the Acts in Scotland' (ibid, 137-144). **The Report of the Departmental Committee on Reformatory and Industrial Schools in Scotland** 1914-16, 34, London, HMSO, cd 7887 had a section entitled 'Are Committals in Scotland excessive in

Number' (ibid, 22-24)

9. The school attendance officer was not the only possible route for extraordinary contact between the school and parents. Messages might go from school back to the home about the physical state of the child.

Belle's teacher, for example, first declared that she needed glasses. Her mother had to pay 1/9d for them. Similarly, a school representative might comment on the apparel of a child. Several respondents had paraffin rubbed into their hair to keep them free of vermin. Some specifically mentioned the school 'inspection'. A couple of respondents commented that they were 'allowed' to go barefoot to school in summer, but teachers would tell them if they thought it was too cold. Sandy remembers being bare foot in winter as well as summer, apparently without any response from the school.

Unfortunately, I have not the material to investigate properly this possible route of intervention in the family.

10. The first serious attempt in the U.K. to regulate school-children's work out of school hours was in the Scottish Education Act of 1878 (Keeling, 1914). The intention of that Act was to prohibit any street trading by children under the age of ten. The wording of the Act nullified this intention and instead it succeeded only in restricting the hours during which school-children could be employed. 'Work' was prohibited in the evening after nine o'clock from April through October and after seven the rest of the year. The Employment of Children Act of 1903

enabled Scottish School Boards to make bye-laws further restricting the employment of school-children. The Boards of Scotland's four major cities were among the minority which actually made use of the act. Edinburgh, Dundee and Glasgow set ten as the minimum age for part-time employment, as did most other Boards. Aberdeen, however, set their minimum at twelve. Maximum permissible working hours were also typically specified in the bye-law. The modal maximum was three and a half hours per school day for ten and eleven year olds and four hours for 13 and 14 year olds (Keeling, 1914).

11. Her father was a sheep farmer near Inverness.

12. Roberts (1975, 18) concludes, on the basis of her interviews, that 'in general it was regarded favourably'. Interestingly, part-time work by girls was rare among her respondents.

13. For discussion of the prevalence of the view that married women should not 'have to' go out to work and indeed should only work if 'forced' to, see Roberts (1977) and also Gittens (1975), Rice (1981) and Taylor (1977).

14. If the legislation restricting the part-time employment of school children could not easily be characterised as a route of intervention in family, this was also true of legislation intended to restrict various other activities. For example, the licensing legislation had little influence. The majority of respondents did not drink alcohol till well beyond the permitted age and there

is no evidence of parents being in any way out of tune with this aspect of the licensing law. As for children fetching their parents beer, several respondents mentioned this practice as if the law did not exist. (Indeed, in the case of one particularly old respondent it did not.) However, two respondents stated that they did not like being sent for beer and one refused to go because she did not like being seen going into the licensed grocers. This refusal was permitted, suggesting a lack of conviction on the father's part concerning the reasonableness of the request.

In this case, and in fact in the case of all the legislation discussed, it is impossible to unravel the exact impact of the legislation itself. In this case the evidence is somewhat conflicting. But even in cases where there is absolutely no evidence of legislation impinging on the working-class family, if the behaviour is not in contradiction to the legislation, it is of course not possible to state categorically whether the legislation had already transformed practice prior to my respondents reaching the specified ages or whether the conditions it was attempting to eliminate were always rare.

15. Humphries (1981) cites several examples of parents verbally and/or physically assaulting teachers in retaliation for treatment of their children. Only Bob related such an incident. Such incidents do not contradict the view that parents may back up teachers so as not to appear a lesser authority. Although Humphries does not make general statements about why parents sometimes

intervene, in many of the examples, the punishment dished out to children was unequivocally excessive.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE BALANCE OF EMPHASIS BETWEEN THE FAMILY AND THE INDIVIDUAL: THE CASE OF THE YOUNG ADULT

Individualism is a difficult concept. It refers to a state of mind: a set of attitudes to self, others and society. It also refers to a way of being, of acting and interacting. Many social analysts, from 19th century giants like Durkheim (1964) to more recent writers like MacPherson (1962) have regarded the spread of individualism as integral to the emergence of modern society.

It is difficult to offer a single definition of individualism. Lukes (1973,1) identifies and discusses 'its various distinct traditions of use'. He identifies eleven constituents or 'unit ideas' of individualism, but argues that the notion of 'the abstract individual' is common to many (ibid, 138-145). That is, the notion that every person is 'the sole proprietor of his own person and capacities - the absolute proprietor in that he owes nothing to society for them' (MacPherson, 1962, quoted in Lukes, 1973, 139). Macfarlane (1978,59) describes the picture of society from this viewpoint: 'society is constituted of autonomous, equal, units, namely separate individuals, and that such individuals are more important, ultimately, than any larger constituent group.' The family is 'the larger constituent group' with which I am concerned. The logic of the 'abstract individual' is that the individual owes no debt to the family and is ultimately the more important unit than the family.

A grasp of this notion seems easy enough. However, it becomes more difficult as soon as the focus is shifted from describing the content of the ideas of individualism to describing the practice. How do individualistic beings, actors and societies go about being individualistic?

Part of the difficulty is an awareness of the real impossibility of the individualistic person and the individualistic society: all individuals are shaped to a degree by their social context and cannot therefore owe nothing to society. Nevertheless, the ideas of individualism and their protagonists are real enough. I am not suggesting that an individualistic person is someone who thinks they are individualistic when they are not. Rather it is a question of degree. In whatever way individualism is acted out, there can be no society in which everyone acts 'the abstract individual' to the full, but in some societies people go about being more individualistic than others. The authors in chapter two were all of the view that members of 'the modern family' were more individualistic than members of previous family forms. It is a question of the emphasis placed on the individual as the ultimate unit as opposed to the emphasis on the family which is the issue.

I also have to remind the reader that authors assume class differences in the distribution of individualism. With the exception of Shorter, the major authors discussed in chapter two anticipated that an emphasis on 'the abstract

individual' would initially be more developed in the middle-class family.

Tilly (Tilly, 1974; Scott & Tilly, 1975; Tilly & Scott, 1978) argues that individualistic values were adopted at different rates not only by different classes but also by men and women. She suggests that working-class women were the last group to become individualistic: they continued to adhere to familistic values when individualism had encroached all around them. Tilly describes familistic values as the antithesis of individualism: 'the goals and needs of the family unit, whether extended or nuclear, were considered paramount, not those of the individual members. These values sanctioned work by all in the interest of all, in order to keep the family a viable economic and social unit' (Tilly, 1974, 8).

Some authors do suggest how individualism as opposed to familism manifests itself in the family. Stone (1965, 151), for example, suggests family members would expect and demand autonomy, privacy and self-expression. He also talks of introspection and interest in personality.

Again, of course, it is a question of degree. Complete 'autonomy', 'privacy' and 'self-expression' are an impossibility. Moreover, they inevitably vary throughout an individual's life course. No author is suggesting that in 'the modern family' the infant is autonomous. But when Parsons talks of 'training in independence' and Aries of the family helping children to rise in the world 'without collective ambition' they are both pointing to an emphasis

on 'the abstract individual' in child rearing.

For some authors, like Parsons and Aries, one of the distinctive features of 'the modern family' is parents' willingness to encourage their children 'to get on' even although it means the children are then lost to the parents. Not all authors describe parents as taking the initiative in fostering individualism. Shorter, in his discussion of working class families, assumes working-class sons and daughters proclaimed themselves 'abstract individuals' in spite of their parents.¹

In the discussion below I select a small number of decisions and issues from respondents' lives as useful indicators of the balance of emphasis between individual and family as the ultimate unit, between individualism and adherence to familistic values. In the main they are focused around the life-events of leaving full-time education, entering work and leaving home: the decision to leave school early, the decision to go on to further education, choice of employment, the division of earnings between the respondent and the family, change in privileges at home associated with these transitions, the decision to leave or stay at home.

I try to unravel and weigh up elements of personal self-assertive choice and elements of serving family needs and goals. I assume that, in a family in which there was an emphasis on the individual, parents would make some effort to accommodate individual desires with respect to

these decisions. I also assume that young people would not be reticent about expressing and acting on their own wishes.

I have selected these life events because they are generally regarded as signposts in the individual life course: they signify becoming 'adult' (Modell et al., 1976). By focusing on these transitions and their aftermath, I maximise the possibility of finding individualistic behaviour and attitudes. By doing so I avoid the possible charge that, even in an individualistic society, young children do not demonstrate autonomy and self-assertiveness. I reject the charge of artificially amplifying individualism by choosing a particularly self-assertive phase of the life-course. The notion of the inherently restless and rebellious youth is itself a historically specific construct (Gillis, 1974; Humphries, 1981) not a natural reality.

There was, of course, some variation in the age at which respondents made these transitions. As is discussed below, there was systematic variation by class. Also, because roughly half of respondents were born in or before the year 1900 and roughly half in the decade 1901-1910 (see Table Four, Appendix Two), respondents could make the same transition at the same age but in different years. Some respondents made some or all of these transitions before the First World War, while for others they took place in the early inter-war period. In chapter four I suggested that these two periods are not radically different

'historical times':that is, the nature of society was not profoundly and permanently altered by the First World War, although direct experience of war fighting and of war losses had profound effect on many individuals.

Working-class children: leaving school and entering work

Leaving school early

The majority of working-class children left school at the legal age of 14 and went straight into some form of employment. Some, however, left school and started work before 14, typically by receiving an exemption certificate legally permitting them to do so. In some cases leaving school early was obviously a decision made by the child without reference to parents. Eck's brother Joe (see the previous chapter) who played truant for a whole year because his parents did not support the idea that he should be out of school, is an extreme example. But often leaving school before 14 was not an independent personal choice but rather a response to family need. A specific family crisis, such as the death, illness or absence of a parent was the typical precipitating factor.

A fifth of my working-class respondents had lost one of their parents before they were 14. Thus the family had lost either its principal wage earner or its principal domestic labourer. Sometimes assistance came from outwith the family, in a few cases the loss was rectified by re-marriage, but often the remaining family personnel had to make up for the absence if the family was to survive.

Obviously the size and age structure of the family would limit the possible response. Because some domestic work was regarded as women's work the gender composition of the family was also a constraint.

Jessie's father organised an exemption for her at 13 so that she could spend time doing domestic work. Her mother died when she was four years old, the youngest of four children. Until her death, when Jessie was ten, grannie used to come and help with meals. Her older sister took on the role of housekeeper until she 'got browned off' and went to stay with her mother's sister. I asked about the consultation between her and her father.

"No, he just said, 'If I could get you away at 13 you could do a wee bit.'"

Of her own feelings Jessie explained:

"I ae mind of [always remember] that night I left. I didnae go back. I'd to take my books all up to the school master. He says, 'Are you happy you're going.' I says, 'No. No just happy. I could bide but I'm mair needed at home.'" (Jessie, ironmoulder and miner's daughter, born 1897)

Betty, the fourth child and oldest girl of nine children, was also taken out of school at 13 so that she could help in the house. In this case, it was the sheer volume of work that her mother had to cope with, exacerbated by a less certain income,² which provoked the exemption. Betty is quoted in chapter two as saying that she sympathises with those in the position of oldest daughter "because she does get it put on to her". She accepted early school leaving with resignation.

"Yousee, with there being nine of us I was the only one

that was left, I mean the only one to help." (Betty, miner's daughter, born 1905)

Such decisions were not resented as dictates coming from parent to child. Rather they were accepted fatalistically as part of the constraints within which the family operated. There are two possible interpretations of this acceptance, however, which lead to different conclusions with reference to the theme of this chapter. It is possible that such acceptance stems from a commitment to a familistic ideology, the idea that each member must strive for the whole. Alternatively the acceptance could be a resigned recognition of the absence of resources with which to pursue self-interest.

In real life cases, however, it is often impossible to make these distinctions. Women leaving school early to take on the role of housekeeper simultaneously acknowledge a lack of choice and a willingness to do it.

Interestingly, when respondents did forcefully articulate a desire to leave school early it was expressed either in personal terms or in terms of helping mother, not in terms of 'the family'. The sentiments of 'helping mother' cannot be straightforwardly categorised as familistic values. The following respondent articulates his sense of family responsibility in these terms. I asked if work in the pit is what he wanted to do when he left school.

"No. It was just a case of getting a job with a pay attached to it. I knew - my mother was a good liver, you know, and used to pan things out very well but - it was hard going and I knew it. I knew for quite a long time. I

said, 'I'll have to get a job'. I got a job." (Mickey, born 1895, miner's son)

Further examples of wishing to help mother are given below and I will, therefore, return to this topic.

Choice of employment

Just as some respondents left school in response to family need, so some took jobs which were more suited to family needs than to their preferences.

Nina left school early in response to a drop in family income. When at school she hoped she would get a job in an office.

"But I had to leave school because it was during the war and my brothers had been called up as well as my father, so that we were really needing the money and I went into Thomson and Porteous [tobacco factory in Leith]³ before I was 14." (Nina, plumber's daughter, born 1903)

Nan, like a number of respondents, wanted to be a dressmaker. Her teacher put her name down for an apprenticeship.

"But I'd have had to have worked for a whole year without getting any money and that wouldn't have done for my mother. So it was just a case of couldnae work all that time for nothing." (Nan, seaman's daughter, born 1897)

Sheila did start as an apprentice dressmaker, but her mother made her leave. She was paid 2/6d a week. "I was getting on fine and loved it. Mother said that the wages were too small." Belle's first job was in a factory making golf bags. She had found this job herself. Her big sister worked in Alder McKae's making munitions.

"She said to my mother, 'Belle could come into munitions and ... you get piece work, and she'll get more money'".

Her mother agreed to get Belle up at half past five so that she could accompany her sister to her work. There they spoke to the manager, who told her to start at nine that day.

"I said, 'Oh, but I've got a job. I'd need to give notice.' ... Where I was working was nice. All the girls were nice. I went and told the boss and he said 'You know we are switching to war work. I think it is unfair that you are leaving. You're a good worker. You can work here.' I said 'Oh, my sister spoke for me to start.'" (Belle, shoe maker's daughter, born 1900)

In the examples above, respondents express a sense of having no choice⁴. They felt they ~~had to~~ take a job which paid more in spite of their ambitions.

Again some respondents talked of 'helping mother' as a reason for laying aside their own wishes. When Eric left school he got a job in the rubber mill (the North British Rubber Company, Edinburgh) moving tyres from one part of the plant to another. His initial pay was high, 21/- a week. I asked why he took this job.

"It was either that or McEwans' brewery. And I had to look after my mum⁵. I had to get a job right away. My ambition was to be a joiner but I got no option. I had to go where I got some money for my mother. She went out to work. She had to rise at half past four in the morning ... She used to clean offices and then I used to get a bob or two going messages. That is why I had to get the first job I could." (Eric, born 1905, driver's son)

Few respondents knew what they wanted to do when they left school and even fewer did what they wanted to do.⁶ For example, when I asked Wattie if it was up to him what he did when he left school he replied:

"No, it was a sort of family conference. I wanted to go into the printing; the lithograph side, not the letterpress side. But, eh. My uncle worked in Nelson's at the time [printers, Edinburgh]. He was trying to get me a job in

there but there were no vacancies, so I got a job as a letterpress man." (Wattie, scavenger's son, born 1898)

Charles wanted to be an engine driver.

"Father says, 'You've a long way to go to be an engine driver.' Because you had to start as a cleaner and work your way up as a fireman, a fireman to a - [You] didn't get simple into engineering, that sort of thing, those days. No. Father put me in [as an apprentice joiner]. I didnae get my own choice. We didnae really get [a choice] in those days. You were lucky to get a job." (Charles, born 1906, foreman joiner's son)

For some working-class children, no decision was involved in their initial 'choice' of work. If there was a dominant occupation, as in mining villages, they assumed they would do what everyone else did. In mining towns and villages, boys took it for granted that they would be miners and women also knew what their future work would be. They took it for granted that they would go into service.

Others left school with no idea of what they wanted and found themselves jobs in a haphazard manner. In the case of a substantial minority of respondents, their choice of work was determined by their parents, irrespective of their own wishes. Again this was typically accepted fatalistically as the way things were.

Middle-class daughters, further education and entering work

The mean age of leaving full-time education among middle-class respondents (fathers with professional, commercial and business occupations) was 20 years old (see table three in Appendix two). The range of ages was from 16 to 22. The middle-class sons and daughters, then, were considerably older than working-class children when leaving school and entering work. Even respondents whose parents

could be described as 'struggling' petite bourgeoisie had an expectation that they would stay on at school beyond 14. Bill's mother, for example, used to say that he would go to university to be a doctor, although, in fact, after her death, he worked in their butcher's shop at the age of twelve.

The majority of my middle-class respondents are women. I have some information on their brothers, but not enough, on this topic of age of leaving further education, to compensate for the small number of male respondents. It is possible that the mean age of school leaving was lower for middle-class men than women. Since some middle-class women did not intend to enter employment, their education could be a form of amusement and of taking time 'off their hands'. The education of sons was always more purposive.

In contrast to working-class experiences, for none of these respondents was there any sense in which they felt the family depended on them getting a job. There were differences in expectations concerning future occupations related to socio-economic differences within the middle class. Some middle-class daughters did not expect to enter employment, others had a sense that it was their responsibility, ultimately, to be able to keep themselves. Some were aware that family resources could not support their own ambitions. For example, Irene changed from an honours (four year MA) degree to an ordinary degree, after her father died. But there was no sense of needing to

support the family.

Often daughters had considerable freedom in shaping their education. Fiona, for example, was sent to a fee paying school in Edinburgh, St Margaret's. Fiona describes herself as 'keen on learning'. She became disgruntled with the school when the headmistress would not let her sit her leaving certificates as she had not sufficiently demonstrated her academic nature. Her parents allowed her to transfer to the Merchant school, Queen St. After a year there in which she acquired her leaving certificates and Higher Music, she went to boarding school for three years.

"I went away to boarding school, to Southport, because some of my friends were going there and I went with them. But I was only there three years or something like that. But none of the rest of my family had been to boarding school. They'd been sent abroad to finish or something like that."

Fiona was one of a number of respondents who did not anticipate working to support herself. About a year after she came home from boarding school she went to Edinburgh Gardening School, to relieve the boredom of being at home and of 'having to be careful' after a threatened appendicitis.

"We weren't very hard worked. If you didn't feel like it the two ladies who ran it said, 'Oh, just sit down. Don't dig today, dear.' But still, we learnt quite a lot, to look after hens and we went to horticultural college and took botany and horticulture and that sort of thing. But if your father could afford to keep you at home in those days you just didn't take a job. You just played around. But my one sister, she became a nurse and the other two didn't do much, got married. It just wasn't the thing to do, for a girl to take a job." (Fiona, born 1901, merchant's daughter)

It was common for upper middle-class daughters to go abroad for a year or two. This was looked forward to as an

option rather than a piece of compulsory training. Grace, for example, went to Germany for a year to stay with a woman who taught German and music. She, too, did not anticipate working.

"Girls of my generation didn't go into careers. Father didn't approve of girls of my station working. He called it 'taking the bread out of others' mouths.'" (Grace, born 189?, chemist's daughter)

Similarly, university courses were chosen because of their intrinsic interest. Caroline, for example, never anticipated using horticulture in particular or a university degree in general, but went to university to study horticulture.

Neither Caroline, Grace nor Fiona expected to work. After leaving full-time education, they lived at home and entered a round of private parties and dances. This was perceived as a time when you enjoyed yourself, within certain prescribed limits. They were no more employed in domestic work at home than they were in paid work outside the home. This same life-style could be experienced as one of freedom and leisure - "you just played around," as Fiona said - or as one of limits and restraints. Grace gave the following enthusiastic account of how the time was spent.

"Oh, sewing and fiddling about and meeting your friends and dancing and enjoying yourself ... Well, we had a lot of little parties, a lot of little dances in our own homes then. That was 1918, 1919. I was allowed to have anyone I wanted to dinner on a Saturday evening. Both maids were out and I had to cook the supper, which wasn't a very great one, but I could have my friends I wanted in then. And we had great parties in the house, little dances, ping pong parties. It sounds funny now, but we had great fun. And tennis, a lot of tennis. You took your time and there was nothing rushed or fussed about, in those days.... But with

the students you went to the students' union. I had great parties there with all the different clubs. And people gave big parties." (Grace, born 189?, chemist's daughter)

Caroline expressed awareness of some limitations.

"I think we were very helpless [at boarding school]. I think we should have learned more but it just wasn't done in our day. If I'd wanted to be a nurse, for example, it wouldn't have been at all popular, you know. It wasn't the thing to do. ...And then the depression came in the thirties and I wanted to earn my own living. I had a secretarial job in Cape Town. My eldest sister never did any job. It wasn't thought of in her days. She just enjoyed herself and then got engaged and married. My second sister went to Atholl Crescent and had various jobs and that was alright, but they wouldn't have thought some jobs were right or necessary." (Caroline, mill owner's daughter, born 1910)

Some respondents with similar backgrounds actively turned away from this life-style. Some daughters chose to work despite surprise or resistance on the part of their parents. Florence and Moira⁷ were not expected to work and yet both of them did.

"Oh, there nearly was a scene when I said I wanted to work! My father said, 'I never thought, a daughter of mine, earning a living!' That was the one sort of remnant of old fashionedness, shall we say. That would be in 1923 or so. But he'd seen that we all had a training of some kind. A qualification. And when the depression came along we were jolly glad of it; we all were." (Florence, born 1902, accountant's daughter)

Florence's father's opposition did not go further than this outburst. Moira's parents were supportive from the beginning, although they had not expected her to work.

"There was no suggestion that I should do anything at all. My father quite agreed I should do something [when she raised the idea of working]. Mother didn't mind. I mean, I might. But my grandmother, father's mother, and my aunts they thought it was very.. shouldn't do that. I think I followed in the footsteps of one aunt who also rebelled and became a nurse and, eh, they allowed her to do it but they...it was very...'Oh, no, she shouldn't be doing that! She should be staying at home tending to the flowers.' Terrible! Oh, no, my parents weren't like that. Mother

said, 'Yes, well, if you want to do it.' I said, 'I couldn't live this life at all.'" (Moirra, born 1889, lawyer's daughter)

She went to a secretarial school to learn shorthand and typing.

"My grandparents, they thought it was a bit of a joke. Of course, I was quite serious. I was going to earn my living and be independent."

Translation work for a doctor gave her five pounds a month.

"Of course, if I hadn't been living at home I couldn't have managed. Again, I wasn't satisfied." She left home during the war to work for the Ministry of Munitions in London. Here she did clerical, secretarial and some translation work for three pounds a week, and was then keeping herself. For her, working was clearly a way of asserting her autonomy and she set about this consciously and deliberately.

For both Moira and Florence, to seek employment was a personal decision, taken despite awareness that to do so was somewhat deviant. In contrast to this, some middle-class daughters had always expected that they would enter paid employment. This expectation was certainly shared by their parents, and may have been fostered by parents.

"I'd always wanted to be a teacher. Either that or a doctor. You see there had been generations of teachers in my family. My father, his father, his father." (Violet, born 1899, schoolmaster's daughter)

Some, like Catherine, were less positive about what form of work they would do but, nevertheless, took it for granted that they would work. Catherine went to the local higher grade school till she was 16, when she sat her

Highers. I asked if she knew when leaving school what she wanted to do.

"No. I don't think so. I wasn't interested in teaching, that was one thing. So I went to Skerry's College in Glasgow and took English and Maths and Shorthand Typing and Book-keeping. And from there I went to my first post." (Catherine, born 1902, commercial traveller's daughter)

I asked if she could have chosen not to work.

"Oh, I couldn't really answer that because the question never arose. It was just automatic that, all my friends, we all went from school into something. I mean none of my friends stayed at home. We were all anxious to go out and earn some money. I wouldn't say our livelihood, but some money. It was mostly pocket-money, what we earned."

Liz was identified in the previous two chapters as at the boundary of middle and working class. Her choice of work was shaped by family concerns. She not only assumed that she would work but assumed she would work for her mother.

"With mother placed as she was, with running the post office and short of staff, and I'd already been initiated into it as much as I'd sometimes stood watching her clerks working, before, when I was still at the school, when there would be occasions when I would have to call in at the office ... I got, sort of, the knowledge of it without having done the work and it was just automatic that I went into that. Really as much because she needed help, and also [it was] a training. And it was with the idea, at that stage, of going into the Civil Service. I did sit the Civil Service exams but I did not take up my appointment. For the same reason, my mother needed me more than me going into a head office." (Liz, born 1899, telegraph superintendent's daughter)

For the majority of middle-class daughters, choice of work was not shaped by concern to help parents. Middle-class daughters, then, often had considerable say in their education and subsequent occupation, although, of course, the range of 'suitable' occupations from which they could choose was very restricted. Only Rachel among my

respondents was 'put in for' a job by her father, rather than choosing for herself. Only Liz was motivated by a concern for a family member or for the family. Most daughters were able to choose between the available options with little parental interference.

My evidence suggests that sons of professional, commercial and business fathers were not very different from daughters in these respects. Some freedom of choice was exercised by Richard and Robert but not by Fraser and Bill, sons of small business proprietors: both the latter were 'encouraged' into their father's business. Alexander's attitude to work was also tempered by his parents' situation. His father earned 300 pounds a year in an administrative post. Alexander was the youngest son. He turned down an opportunity to be a professional cricketer: "All my brothers were leaving home. I felt my parents needed me at home."

Some upper middle-class parents believed that their daughters should not work. But the two respondents who challenged this view met little real resistance. In neither case was 'family honour' used as an argument against daughters taking employment, although Florence's father's reference to 'a daughter of mine earning a living' suggests that he felt some personal loss of face. Nor was 'the family' invoked as a reason for going out to work. Middle-class young people were working more unequivocally for themselves. In contrast to the working class, only in

the most marginal of petite bourgeoisie were daughters or sons expected to leave school early because the family needed their labour.

The disposable income and independence of the young person

The young working-class earner at home

In this section I ask to what extent entering full-time work and earning a wage was associated with a clearer recognition of the earner as 'proprietor of her or his own properties'. Did the transition, for example, result in greater autonomy, greater freedom from parental authority? I use three indicators: the continued exercise of curfews, demands for service from parents and the balance of needs and wants reflected in the division of the young earner's wage. Of the three, I concentrate on the last. It is tempting to assume that the way the wage was divided reflected the balance of emphasis between the individual and the family. This cannot be decided a priori, but is worthy of investigation.

Although some respondents were clearly very proud of their first wage-pocket and extremely conscious that they were now making a more substantial contribution to the household economy, they were still subordinate to their parents. As Eck put it: "Aye, well. They were the gaffer, right enough."

Parents continued to expect children to be home by a certain time at night and to seek their permission if they wanted to be out late. During the first working years, almost without exception, both boys' and girls' entire wage

went to 'the house'. In practice, this usually meant it was given to their mother,⁸ who in turn gave them pocket-money. In other words, the system was the same as it had been for earnings from part-time employment while at school. Pocket-money was typically a small amount, 6d or 3d, although some had 1/- or 2/- or even half a crown. These differences are partly accounted for by differences of period (the inflation of the war years).

The wages of young people were typically low. The vast majority of male respondents were earning more than 25/- a week by the age of 21. Several were earning a few pounds. First year apprentices, by comparison, were often receiving only 6/-. Many of the first jobs young people had were low-paid jobs. Women often never escaped low-paid work: many more women than men continued to earn less than a pound a week well into their twenties.

At some stage a large portion of respondents started to 'keep themselves'. That is, the money they had each week was for more than cigarettes or occasional visits to the cinema, the dancing, or other entertainment. It now paid for clothes too. This happened in one of two ways: either pocket-money was increased with an understanding that the earner was now keeping her/himself; or the earner paid a fixed sum of 'digs money' or 'board' and kept the remainder, rather than handing over the wage intact. The change in system was usually announced by a parent but sometimes requested by the child. An understanding of this

change is important to the theme of this section. An increase in pocket-money, or a change to paying board, clearly meant more disposable income for the young earner. This in itself is an increase in freedom. To what extent did the change represent a recognition of the child as a self-determining individual? The experiences of respondents fall into three categories: those who never received much pocket-money, those who received an increase in pocket-money and those who paid board. Each is discussed below.

Several respondents, nearly all women, received only small amounts of pocket-money, all the time they lived at home, and yet were expected to buy shoes or clothes themselves. Bessie, for example, although she raised her wage to one pound, still only got a shilling pocket-money. She saved up for shoes out of this money. Similarly, Betty never earned much money and had very little to spend before she was married at 26.

"You may have got 3d or 6d and we were in the penny bank, in the church ... and we went up religiously with the bank-books maybe just putting in 3d or 6d. Then, maybe you were needing something or there was something you wanted for yourself, then you would get it." (Betty, brass finisher's daughter, born 1890)

Young women did not necessarily resent their lack of spending power. Peggy worked in a string of jobs before she got married at 21, never earning big wages. She was often encouraged to leave work by her 'mammy' because of her health.

"Mammy was good to me so I never grudged. I never

ever kept myself. And then, you see, we had boarders in the house and all the boarders were good to me too, giving me money to go to the pictures.' (Peggy, 'adopted' by mother's landlady, born 1906)

Of course some had more pocket-money and more freedom to spend it. Nina, for example, got 5/- a week. Her mother expected her to save 1/- each week: 6d for clothes and 6d for the future. Unlike many other young women, she never did save. Some daughters, Rosie for example, not only saved but gave their parents back the money.

"I've seen my mother maybe having a big bill to pay and no having enough to pay for it. I used to lift my holiday money. It was just in the holiday fund, and the cashier just used to say, 'Right, Rosie, just start over again. It's always handy to be in that.' So every now and again I would lift it to give to my mother. 'Cause, well, we were awfie dead against debt." (Rosie, born 1908, baker's daughter) Rosie got 2/6d a week and she put 2/- in the holiday fund. She explained that she did not need much pocket-money.

"I used to just keep a sixpence. Well you could get places. You could get into the pictures for 3d. It was more - we used to go walks and that - cycling. My man [future husband] and I, ah'm talking about. Well, I didnae really need anything to spend, actually. There wasnae so many - well we didnae get so much to the pictures then and even at that it was the only place you could go. So I used to put my 2/- in the holiday fund." (Rosie, born 1908, baker's daughter)

Rosie explained the restrictions placed on her when she was 'going out' with her man.

"I was only allowed out three times a week anyway. Half past nine Sunday and ten o'clock through the week, sometimes half past nine. And if I didnae do what I was told I was kept in and deprived of my nights out."

For Rosie, Bessie and Betty the status of earner did not bring with it a marked increase in autonomy and independence. Moreover, none of them ever complained about their pocket-money or tried to argue they deserved greater

freedom because of their earnings. All continued to have their leisure time limited by household demands and parental curfews. Some respondents did make such an argument, however. Maggie put it most succinctly:

"When I come tae 19 I just let her [mother] ken I wasnae taking any mair orders. I was bringing a wage in tae her, you know. " (Maggie, born 1899, docker's daughter)

Mickey asked his mother for more pocket-money. He suggested that his respect (and affection) for his mother depended on being treated fairly.

"I can always remember saying to my mother once, 'Oh, I think I should get a bit more pocket-money now, mum. You know, we all go and have a game of billiards on a Saturday and we play ha'penny a put.' [Mother says] 'Aye, you're entitled to it, son.'

She had an old school-friend come to see her, and she was one of the hard type. Her sons used to work in public houses and different jobs. She says, 'Mabel, this is the way you want to give them their pocket-money [drawing back an empty hand, as if to smack]. Mabel, that's too much for that boy, 3/6d.' I told my mother, 'Well, if that's the school-friend you've been telling us about, I don't think very much of her. She'd no right to interfere with what I was getting. Apart from anything else, she was telling you that she did this with her own sons and they were flinging stones at her. That would be the day, that I would be flinging stones at you through my pocket-money.' " (Mickey, born 1895, miner's son)

Tom's sister was keeping house, since their mother's death.

His brother, Wullie, had a row with her about pocket-money.

Tom decided to take up the issue with his father.

"She [his sister] was another bad tempered tinker. I said [to brother], 'If you want to say anything about the pocket-money, stay in tonight and I will broach the subject with my father. She has nothing whatever to do about it.' I had just come out of the army, of course, and had my gratuity. So I broached the subject with my father and she started shooting off her neck. But I told her, 'Shut up, you have nothing whatever to do about it.' With being in the army I had got my mind broadened out a bit. Before that you darenae open your mouth in our house. Oh, my God, no! but after I came home, I let them know that I was going to have my say. So we got the pocket-money business

settled. I told brother that in future any overtime went in your pocket." (Tom, miner's son, born 1897)

The change in arrangements resulting from Tom's discussion meant increased control over disposable income, in a way which narrowed the gap between this system and the system of paying for digs. From henceforth a part of income, overtime, would not be declared.

Tom, Mickey and Maggie were not exceptional in feeling that as they were earning and getting older they had the right to comment on their pocket-money or the demands their parents made of them. In the accounts of Tom and Maggie, however, the self assertion involved had a confrontational aspect, as if they expected resistance. Tom had to wait until he had been in the army (the influence of army experience is discussed briefly below) and Maggie, until she was 19, before feeling able to comment on how household affairs were conducted.

In some households, parents spontaneously conceded greater freedom to their children at certain ages. Young people who were paying their parents digs money often had considerable autonomy. One obvious difference between an increase in pocket-money and paying digs money was that 'paying digs' gave the young person far greater control of their income.

"In these days it was 25/-. I gave her [mother] more after [in later years] but that was the usual thing. If you got board you thought you were the Lord of the Isles. You always had a pound in your pocket and a pound was your best friend." (Andrew, born 1904, fisherman's son)

Indeed, in some cases it was almost a reversal of roles of

giver and receiver between parents and children. Jenny was one of the few women paying digs money.⁹

"Oh, I was keeping myself. My mother gave us a winter rig-out and a summer rig-out. 'Now', she says, 'your apprenticeship is finished, you'll keep yourself, and you'll know the value of money.' That was alright. We were making good pays, right enough, and if you had good time-keeping you got a bonus. I remember one week I got about seven pounds extra. I said, 'Ma, I've never seen so much money in a' my life.' She says, 'What are you gi'in me.' I said, 'I was skint through the week and asked for a shilling and you wouldnae give me it.' I gave her two pounds odd. The best o' it was you were keeping yoursel', your pay was your ain, but you had to get a bank-book." [She was encouraged to save up in case she wanted anything] "... a costume or something like that." (Jenny, labourer's daughter, born 1897)

Her mother asks the question because a share of her bigger pay is not automatic. Jenny could have paid her the usual (now forgotten) sum. Giving more had something of the status of a gift.

In some households, the independence that went with this system was not just financial, it was symbolic of an independence of parental authority. Eck illustrated this by comparing himself and his brother, Joe, who was four years older. I asked Eck if he knew how much pocket-money Joe got.

"No. To tell you the truth, he was on his own in the pit. He didnae work tae my faither. He was on his own. I've seen him tae'in a big wad o' notes, across my nose. A big wad o' notes. Aye, that's what he used to do with you, tormenting the life out of ye." [Interviewer] 'Did you ever think it was unfair that he was getting to keep that money when you were getting half a crown?' "Aye, it was unfair alright, but he was on his own, you see, and you couldnae stop it." [Interviewer] 'Your mother couldnae have done anything about it?' "Oh, no! Oh, no! He was over age. She had nothing to do with it. Joe was late in getting married in fact ... he would be 30 when he got married.

... [Interviewer] 'And what about yourself, did you ever come home [the worse for drink]?' "No, no at my

mother's. Oh, no!" ... [Interviewer] 'What about Joe - did he ever?' "Joe? ... Aye Joe! He came and went as he liked." [Interviewer] 'How come he managed to come and go as he liked?' "Well, he paid his way ye ken. I wasnae paying for my digs like. I was handing ower my wages. He was paying his digs. ... I had the five shillings a day at the pony driving. Well, I didnae pay my digs off of that, I just handed my mother the pay, and got my pocket-money back like."

Eck refers to his brother as 'over age'. In some households, paying digs coincided with age 21. This was also the age at which many apprenticeships were completed: the norm in several trades was a five year apprenticeship starting at age 16. In several respondents' households, the sum for digs was 25/-. This was a few shillings above the pay of most final year apprentices, but the pay of a time served man would be five shillings or more in excess of this.¹⁰ In some households, 21 was the age of 'a key for the door', thus symbolically and practically removing parents from their position as sole 'gate keepers'.

Eck did not expect to be paying digs until he was 21. In the event, he got married first. His bride was pregnant and he consequently was married when he was exceptionally young, 18 years old.

The balance between the individual and the family in the case of young earners paying board seems to be clearly in favour of the former. This system involved not only greater control over earnings by the young person but also often more freedom from curfews and parental demands. The going rate for 'digs' or 'board' was high, however, and many never paid board. There is more diversity of experience among those receiving pocket-money. Some

received very little and, like Rosie, remained governed by parents. Within this group, responses varied from acceptance to willingness to challenge the system.

More women than men continued to receive pocket-money rather than paying digs. More women than men had very little pocket money and stringent parental restrictions on their free time. Some women, like Agnes, described in the next section, asserted their wants and rejected this system.

By no means all women experienced this apparent lack of autonomy as an imposition. Does this mean we can conclude that these women were 'familistic'? Rosie would then be an example of a group of working-class women who were familistic rather than individualistic. This is exemplified by her willingness to save up the bulk of her pocket-money and then give it to her mother. But the reasons for accepting little pocket-money and parental restrictions are various and perhaps not reducible to 'familistic values'.

Rosie was unconcerned about pocket-money because her social life centred on 'her man' and did not require money. Moreover, she, Bessie and Betty were very anxious to help their mothers: concerns that they were struggling with budgeting, worrying about debt or exhausted with housework were motivating factors. Rosie, however, also talks of a dread of debt which was a shared family concern.

In the case of the group of women which Rosie

represents, it is neither possible to conclude that they were primarily motivated by familistic values, nor is it possible to say that such values had no influence. The evidence suggests that neither is the case. That is, women who behaved in the most familistic manner were not solely or even primarily motivated by familistic values.

Thus, I would argue that among the working-class respondents three relevant categories with reference to the theme of the chapter have emerged. Those who were spontaneously afforded considerable autonomy and therefore became 'abstract individuals'. Secondly, those who negotiated, demanded or asserted autonomy. Thirdly, those who continued to accept rather limited freedom and in some cases organised their lives to help other family members. Sons were more represented in the first two categories than daughters. But even those daughters who were in the third category cannot, unequivocally, be called 'familistic' rather than 'individualistic'.

Middle-class sons and daughters at home, pre-earning, earning and never earning

Most middle-class respondents had very little money at their disposal while in secondary education. In their earlyteens, pocket-money was often 6d or 1/-, similar to the initial pocket-money of very young working-class earners. There were exceptions of course. Robert described the difference between himself and the son of the owner/manager of the local sweet factory.

"Well, I was awfie friendly with Freddy, and after a game

of rugby in the forenoon we would go down to Freddy's house. And Freddy would say 'Right, come on! We'll go out this afternoon.' And I'd say, 'I cannae go out this afternoon, Freddy, I havenae got the money.' So I would go home and I would say to my mother, 'I'm going out with Freddy this afternoon, mother, can you give me a shilling?' She would take me out the garden and she would say, 'If you transplant those, I'll give you a shilling.' I can remember being at Freddy's house in Trinity Road [Edinburgh] ... his father came down the road and Freddy goes up and links arms with him. He says, 'Look, Dad, I'm going out with Robert this afternoon, and I havenae any money.' His old man says, 'Look, Freddy, I gave you a pound yesterday.' Now we're talking in the days when a man was working for 18/- a week. 'But, Dad, I've spent it.' So he opened his wallet, took out a five pound note and handed it to Freddy. Now I've got a shilling. Freddy got five pounds. I says, 'Now look, Freddy, sorry, but this is the end of our friendship. I just can't keep up with you.' (Robert, born 1898, nursery owner/manager's son)

But as noted in chapter five, the normal practice was to keep pocket-money low, regardless of family wealth or income.

There was considerable diversity in size of the disposable income of middle-class respondents in their late teens and early twenties. For the majority, however, their income, earned or unearned, was for their disposal as they had no financial responsibility to the family.

Upper middle-class daughters who did not work but were living at home received an allowance. Caroline's was the most generous, exceeding the income of many poor families.

"When I was 18 [1928] I was given a dress allowance by my father of 120 pounds a year. Well, that was quite a lot in those days and I was able to choose my own clothes and go abroad on it and do all sorts of things."

Fiona's allowance was 50 pounds at age 17 (1918) and Grace did not receive her allowance till she was 21. In comparison to the young working-class earner of the same age, the lower figure was a substantial sum. The important

question is whether this greater spending power was also associated with greater freedom. There is, certainly, nothing to suggest that these respondents felt restricted in how they spent their money.

In some respects, of course, young upper middle-class daughters had a restricted existence. Although not formally chaperoned, they were rarely with people completely unknown to their parents. Grace commented that all the dances she went to were private; there was "none of this going out to [public] dances". Some daughters spent very little time alone outside their parents' household or equivalent settings. Some, like Fiona, were allowed rather more freedom. She could go to the student society parties and invite her friends on Saturday for dinner. If going to a private party, however, she was still collected at the end of the evening: "my own people came for me then". Grace was escorted to and from the balls she attended by a partner, but her parents were supervising the process. "My parents sat up all night till I came home." These restrictions, however, did not inhibit an active and, within the 'appropriate' circles, a self-directed social life.

Unlike working-class respondents, once earning, many middle-class sons and daughters, living with their parents, kept their income and made no contribution to the house. Robert, for example, who was only earning 20 pounds a year in the bank, kept this money and his parents kept him.

This was still true when he was earning three pounds ten shillings a week in his father's nursery. Richard did give some money to his mother when he was earning but the idea was that she saved it up and gave him it back on marriage. Thus he was not contributing to the house. His parents, too, would buy him clothes, although he was able to save up and buy a car when he was about 20.

Although not contributing to the household directly, some middle-class respondents did keep themselves. Catherine, who had always taken it for granted that she would go out and earn, did, but not initially.

"We had to buy - we didn't hand anything into the house - we bought stockings and gloves, small items like that. ... We had to pay for our holiday. We had to save up so much a week. Of course, as soon as we started working we went off on our own for our holiday. As long as my mother felt we were saving, she would add [to the savings]. It was a way of teaching us the value of money." (Catherine, born 1902, commercial traveller's daughter)

Her first pay was 12/6d, but by her late twenties she was earning two pounds ten shillings and keeping herself. She, too, speaks enthusiastically of the social life she had at this time.

"I was 16 when the First World War finished and everybody just went crazy for a social life. That's when all the jazz bands started and boys coming home from the war were all out for a good time. And we had a lot of - we had a big Institute with halls [in her home town] - there were a lot of dances put on there. And we went into Glasgow too. All the offices had an annual dance and we all went to one another's annual dance. We really had a most marvellous time."

This memory of fun needs some qualification: this woman, like many, worked long hours and also did a little housework. Nevertheless, she was certainly not burdened or

restricted by family obligations. Even her account of why she works suggests that work was a means to her own social life rather than a means to either contributing to the family or removing herself as a financial burden on the family. The balance of emphasis between family and individual was clearly on the individual. The idea that to keep one's wages rather than handing them over to the family symbolises an emphasis on the individual is supported by the attitude of respondents to their wage and the relative absence of family demands on them.

There were two exceptions among middle-class respondents to the practice of making no contribution to the household income: Liz and Alexander. Liz, who, as noted above, was working under her mother in the sub post-office, never had her own wage but received pocket-money from her mother of about 5/- a week. Alexander also went into clerical and administrative work. His father had retired from farming and taken a post as secretary to an agricultural association. Alexander, unlike Liz, had control of his income but gave the bulk of it to his mother. He kept back 10/- or a pound and gave her the rest. Both these respondents were more conscious of their parents as, in some sense, needing them. At this stage in their lives, this was not true for the rest, although some subsequently did look after aging parents.

Family obligations of young people away from home

Working class sons in the forces

Joining the forces, going to sea or going to service

were common ways of simultaneously taking work and leaving home. I have already noted that in some areas it was taken for granted that girls went into service. In some families it was something of a tradition for boys to go to sea or join the forces. George said: "All my brothers was soldiers and one a sailor, you see. The family had to leave, you see, for accommodation in these days." George's reference to accommodation indicates that joining the army removed the burden of the offspring from the household. It is of relevance to ask whether leaving home in this way also removed obligation to the household. In other words, were the soldier and seaman sons and the servant daughters now 'unto themselves'?

Going to sea or joining the army in peacetime did sometimes result, in effect, in the severance of obligation. This was not true for most of the respondents who volunteered or were called up during the First World War. The pay for a soldier, at the beginning of the war, was a shilling a day. The soldier could choose to make half his pay over to his parents, in which case the government added the same again. This made a total of 7/- a week received by the parent, while the son was receiving 3/6d. The majority of respondents took this option but this did not always satisfy their parents.

"The boys that didn't leave any allowance to their parents, of course their credits mounted up quicker than ours did, with the result that they used to send home fivers and tenners. I remember getting one letter and it took a bit of reading, you know. It nearly put the dampers on me. [It said that] all the boys were sending. She [mother]

couldn't realise that I was sending home 3/6d of my wages a week. I only had 3/6d. To supplement that I was an officer's batman to start with. I used to get as much again." (Mickey, born 1895, miner's son)

One difference between joining up during the war and in peacetime was that the expectation of returning home was much stronger in the former case. Joining-up was recognised as a response to an emergency situation rather than leaving or abandoning home. All the male working-class respondents who were born in or before 1900 were 'in' the First World War (see appendix two, table two). Those who volunteered typically did so without consulting their parents. They saw it as their decision, even when they knew their parents would not be pleased.

Tom, the miner's son quoted above, talked of having his mind broadened by being in the army and of being able to speak his mind to his father as a consequence. The individual, personal consequences of being in the army in general, and fighting in the First World War in particular, cannot easily be summarised. Prior to army experience, some respondents had been no further from home than walking or cycling distance. The travel and exposure to people from different backgrounds in itself could create a sense of 'experience', that could later translate into self-assertive confidence.

On the other hand, many remained on the rough end of army discipline. Tom attributed much of his confidence to the experience of being made a sergeant. Not all respondents describe their spell in the army in terms of

broadening. George, a conscript, expressed some of the contradictions.

"You were just a number. You were knocked about like an old boot. Oh, they would think nothing, the army instructors, of using their feet on you, you know. When I look back and think on it, where I've been in the army, different countries you know, it is marvellous. You'd never have got past Princes Street [main street in Edinburgh, his home city] if you hadn't been taken away." (George, born 1900, foreman porter's son)

The lasting effects of the 'face of battle' and the incredible carnage, which few, certainly not early volunteers, escaped are unknown (Keegan, 1978). For some, the effect of life in the trenches was a longing for 'home', whether or not it meant parents were 'the gaffers'. "I used to think about home a lot. Life in the trenches was only fit for animals." (Hamish, born 1897, bootmaker's son) The extreme conditions certainly did not typically result in a subsequent disregard for parental authority. Tam, for example, wrote to his mother from the trenches, asking permission to smoke: "I saw some of the lads were better than me in the way they took things." (Tam, born 1898, draper's son)

Working-class daughters in service

The relationship of respondents in domestic service to their families varied. Respondents in service almost invariably came from small towns with little or no employment for women. Thus they were often some distance from home. The majority kept their income while in service. Molly said: "I never remember father and mother expecting any money from us, because we had to keep

ourselves." Her sister Dot added, "I think they were just glad that there was two or three less to keep in the house. 'Cause I don't think my father ever had any more than a pound a week." (Molly and Dot, born 1898 and 1904, linesman's daughters) Kate took this a step further by treating it as her responsibility always to have a post so that her parents never needed to keep her. Moreover, she sent her wage home.

"I left home as I say when I was 15, and apart from that short time I was home to nurse my mother, I was never at home. I never left one job till I had another one to go to. I was never outwith a post. And I never kept a month's salary in my life till six months before I got married. It was sent home. And it was all sent home and sometimes my mother would send five shilling back, maybe half a crown. It's a good job I always had boyfriends." (Kate, born 1908, steel erecting engineer's daughter)

Kate was unusual. The different attitude is clearly not reducible to the state of family finances since her family was better-off than Molly and Dot's.¹¹ Kate represented one extreme of a range of attitudes to the family of origin. The other extreme is to treat going into service as an escape and a relief from family obligations. None of the respondents quite took this position but Jessie came close.¹²

"Because there was nothing [at home]. What I mean, well, you got browned off. You wanted to see something. ... Oh, I had to be grown up when I was left the school, for to get in about it [in order to get on with things], to help [keep the house]. Then when I went to service that was just me. I was away. I never went back to the house agin. I didnae live there any more." (Jessie, born 1897, miner and ironmoulder's daughter)

The majority of respondents in service were between thesetwo extremes, although perhaps nearer to Jessie than

Kate. They kept their earnings, perhaps sending home occasional gifts. They visited home occasionally and often helped with housework when they did.

Middle-class daughters working away from home

The jobs available to young middle-class women often took them away from home. As in Moira's case, working away from home could be an assertion of independence. In her case, asserting independence does not mean shaking off family demands on her time and energy, since they were few, but the rejection of the life-style of a 'young lady of leisure' and a demonstration of her ability to support herself.

Once away from home, any flow of finances between the daughter and her parents went from parent to child. For example, Elizabeth wrote to her parents from France and asked them to send her money, even after she had been keeping herself for a year. Moreover, the young woman was relatively free of family obligations and parental control, although sometimes gifts had 'strings attached'. Elizabeth's father insisted that she travel first class, for example.

Going into digs as an alternative to living at home

A number of respondents lived in digs. The main reason was because their family had broken-up and their parents' home no longer existed. Some working away from home also lived in digs. There were a number of alternatives to digs for young people living away from home. Other kin, most frequently aunts, might provide accommodation. Middle-

class occupations sometimes provided accommodation: teaching and nursing, for example. Various voluntary organisations provided wholesome accommodation for young people. For example, Moira stayed in a club for daughters of professional people, who were under 25 and earning less than a specified amount. In this section, I ask to what extent these other types of accommodation were a financially possible option for young people. And, having established this, I ask to what extent leaving home or the threat of leaving home were used as a means of rejecting family obligations and asserting independence.

The going rate for 'digs money' working-class respondents paid to the family was as much or more than digs would have cost elsewhere. Of the respondents in digs, only one paid 25/-. Douglas, for example, paid 13/6d. For this he had bed and board and his washing done for him. He also had his holidays organised. He stayed with his landlady's parents in the Highlands. He described his landlady as 'the best landlady in the world'. It is clear that he regarded himself as being very comfortable indeed. This sum was still beyond the earnings of many women and young workers. It was, however, possible to pay considerably less for digs. Agnes was in digs at 16 years old when she was earning 7/9d. She paid 6/- a week for which she got bed and board, although she had to do her own washing. Comfortable, of course, is a relative term. She regarded her digs as an improvement on home.

Going into digs, then, was an option, at least financially, for most respondents. It was possible to abandon home, even when earning a low wage, and some young people like Agnes did make this choice. When her mother died, her older sister was 13 she was twelve, her younger brothers were ten and seven and the youngest were sisters of four and two. When she was 14 her older sister left home. 'She went away and stayed with my aunt and we were all just left to paddle our own canoe.' After keeping house herself for two years she went into digs.

"Well, I stayed in the house till I was 16. And I used to go out with a chum, you know. She worked in Duncan's sweetie factory [Edinburgh]. And she says to me, 'You want to get yourself a job.' I says, 'I think I will.' Because you need clothes. Well he [father] would never give us anything for to get clothes. So I said, 'I think I'll go.' I went and got a job in Duncan's sweetie works. I left the house and went away and stayed with a woman, with my chum like. And I got on fine after that." (Agnes, ironmoulder and miner's daughter, born 1894)

Although, at first, her disposable income was only 1/9d after she had paid her digs, this was more than she ever had at home. She put 6d in a shoe menage and 6d in another menage for clothes each week, thus leaving her with 9d spending money.

I asked if her father was angry that she left home in this way: "Oh, yes. When I went to visit he said, 'Are ye back?' I said, 'No, I'm just back to see you.'"

Agnes, like her sister before her, abandoned the role of housekeeper to go into digs. Jessie, discussed in the previous section, had similarly left her father on his own to go into service. Both wanted something for themselves

that was not offered by their family situation. Both were rejecting family responsibilities. Middle-class daughters in their teenage years did not typically have such responsibilities to reject. Moira, however, left home because she wanted to show her financial independence of her parents. There were no instances among my respondents of men deliberately leaving home to go into digs. Young men were typically neither expected to do large amounts of domestic work nor assumed to be dependants.

In a few instances, then, leaving home was a gesture signifying 'I am an individual'. The threat of leaving home was probably used more often than the gesture of leaving home. Elizabeth gives this account of a dialogue between her and her mother:

"'Did that man bring you home last night?' ... 'Of course he did. He's a gentleman.' 'Did the village people see you coming out of his house at that hour of night?' I said, 'I'm sure I don't know.' ... 'You would never have done this if your father would have been alive.' I said, 'He wouldn't have objected.' 'He wouldn't have allowed you a key if he'd known you were going to do that.' He certainly wouldn't. So at that point I said that I would take another job teaching if this was going on, and I never heard any more about it. At 28, to be told you couldn't be seen home!" (Elizabeth, born 1897, commercial traveller's daughter)

The availability of alternative accommodation to the family could be used in arguments by parents as well as by young people, of course. For example, Jenny's mother told her "go into digs then" on one occasion when they argued about money. For the majority of respondents it was not an issue: they were content to stay at home until marriage.

Delaying leaving home and returning home because of family

obligations

Some men and women continued to live at home because they felt their family needed them. Most commonly they did not wish to leave a widowed mother on her own. However, those who devoted themselves to looking after an aging parent often regarded themselves as exceptional. This was articulated by Betty. Betty had left school to keep house. Her mother was ill. She kept house till she was married at age 26. Even then she continued to do much of her mother's housework. There were several of her brothers who worked in the pit still living at home and therefore much heavy washing to do. Betty said that at the time she knew it was not 'right' because it jeopardised her relationship with her husband. She justified it in terms of love of her mother.

"If I made to go out at night, even when I was going - when I met my husband first, I'd say, 'I cannae get oot the night there's two pair of trousers to patch.' He'd say, 'Is there nobody else in the house, only you?' It caused many a row. In fact to tell you the truth it was nearly a bust up because he said that I wasnae normal. I mean I couldnae get out the same as anybody else. ... [I asked if she got pocket money while keeping house] Not a ha'penny. You hardly had any clothes. That is what I say about people - stories in the paper about people that had devoted their life, lost their chances of husbands, this and that. Just thinking of my own self ... many a time I think I wouldnae have had him [husband] if he hadnae been tolerant like that." (Betty, born 1905, miner's daughter)

Betty did marry and leave home. Jean did not until her mother died.

"Anyway, I got this when my father died [Jean was aged 14] - I was the eldest and I would have to see my mother through. And I did, because my brothers were both married. [There were only the three children] They married within a year of each other. Mother and I were left. Then we just carried on taking in boarders... Mother had the boarders

and I had to go home [from work in the hosiery factory] and work at night. There was nothing else for it. [Jean's mother died when she was 41] ... and I didn't marry till after that. I've never grudged it. Certainly at times when I see them with their families grown up then you feel you've missed out, but I never let it worry me. I couldnae get it, so that's the end of it." (Jean, born 1895, cabinet maker's daughter)

In both these cases no direct pressure came from the mother. I would argue that the obligation felt by Betty and Jean was experienced as a personal one, rather than something which everyone expected of them.

Although less common, sometimes sons did not wish to leave their mothers. Eric was the youngest and the last to leave the house; his father was long dead. As noted earlier in the chapter, his choice of work was influenced by a desire to help his mother. When thinking of marriage, he discussed with his mother how she would feel being left alone. She was careful to stress he had no obligation to stay.

"She said, 'No, away you go. You've got your own life to live. I've lived my life.'" (Eric, born 1905, driver's son)

In the case of a single son staying with his mother, it was often unclear who was looking after whom. At best there is a clear cut division of labour into earner and houseworker. Annie told this tale of her brother, Sandy:

"It was a case of do this for Sandy and do that for Sandy. He was treated like a baby, honestly. ... I can remember my sister-in-law saying that my mother had went to her and she [mother] had said to her, 'You know, I don't know what's going to happen to Sandy if anything happens to me, because I know the girls will no take care of him.' I said at the time, 'No, she's right, too. I wouldnae be bothered with him.'" (Annie, stone mason's daughter, born 1905)

Annie's mother never did directly ask Annie to look

after her brother. (She did in fact have him to live with her after their mother's death.) A few mothers actually discouraged their daughters from feeling obliged to look after their siblings. Ina's mother, for example.

"I can mind of saying to my mother, 'Mum, what's going to happen to the boys if anything happens to you?' [Mother replied] 'They'll no do for you what you do for them.' That always stuck [in my mind]. So she says, 'Put them in a home.' 'Oh', I says, 'I couldnae put them in a home.' And I never did."¹³ (Ina, brass finisher's daughter, born 1904)

Devotion to siblings could be regarded as deviant. Rachel, the minister's daughter, devoted considerable time to looking after her baby step-brother and she received this comment from a young man: "'If you don't stop taking out that pram you'll never get anyone yourself.' I said, 'I couldn't care less. I don't want anyone.'" (Rachel, born 1899, minister's daughter)

Just as some working-class daughters continued living at home to look after their mothers, so did some middle-class daughters. Liz and Alexander were noted earlier as exceptions to the general pattern of young people keeping their entire wage. Both had been influenced in their choice of work by their parents' situation. Both stayed at home until or beyond the death of their parents. Liz married, aged 39, shortly after her mother's death. She stressed that she had not been interested in marriage while young and said:

"I would never have married and lived with her [mother] or she with me. As a young woman she [mother] said to me, 'If you ever get married, even if you've got to go into a room' - in these days people didn't - 'never live with in-laws:

be it you own mother or your husband's mother.'" (Liz, born 1899, telegraph superintendant's daughter)

Both Helen and Elizabeth lost their father early in their careers and established a household with their mother. Helen's mother moved with her to her first and subsequent teaching posts. Elizabeth gave up her teaching job to be with her mother, although subsequently they moved together back to Edinburgh. Neither Helen nor Elizabeth married, thus the arrangement was not broken until the death of the mother. Unlike the case of working-class sons and daughters who lived alone with their mothers, their financial support was not needed and yet the arrangement seemed to be taken for granted as the natural response to father's death. Both Helen and Elizabeth were only children who had spent more time than usual with their mothers while younger.

Thus, although there clearly were respondents who felt that looking after parents, particularly mother, was their responsibility, this did not amount to unequivocal adherence to familistic values. Those looking after parents often simultaneously recognised the right of the individual to lead her or his own life. This right was articulated sometimes by respondents themselves, sometimes by parents, sometimes by friends. I suggest that young people who did shape their lives around caring for parents were, therefore, typically aware of a choice. Alexander, for example, stayed at home rather than being a professional cricketer. Jean, like most women in her

situation, was aware that looking after her mother meant delaying or perhaps foregoing marriage. Both Alexander and Jean believed they had made the morally correct choice but, at the same time, they knew that many others would have done otherwise. Moreover, staying home with parents often dovetailed with more personal reasons for wishing to remain at home: lack of interest in marriage, an exceptionally close bond with parents. The devotion of some children, particularly a few daughters, to their mothers, was clearly a factor in some cases. In these cases, the mother/daughter bond had clearly strengthened over the respondent's teenage years.

Conclusion

By looking at particular life-events, I have tried to look at the balance of emphasis between the individual and the family as the ultimate unit, the balance between individualism and adherence to familistic values. The accounts of the development of 'the modern family' anticipated an emphasis on the individual, particularly in middle-class families. Tilly suggests working-class women exhibit continued commitment to familistic values.

My inspection of decisions associated with life-events does indeed reveal some class and gender differences. The timing of leaving school and the choice of occupation is often determined by family concerns in the case of working-class children, particularly girls, and is rarely so in the case of middle-class children. Nevertheless, it was not possible to conclude that the former were, at this stage in

their life-course, bound by familistic values. It proved impossible to distinguish behaviour motivated by commitment to familistic values from resigned recognition of an absence of resources with which to pursue self-interest.

Class differences were also reflected in the disposition of the young earner's wage. The majority of middle-class earners kept their own wage in a way which symbolised an emphasis on the individual. Working-class children initially handed over their wages and received back pocket-money. Middle-class children were considerably older when earning their first wage, however. Once young earners were in their mid-20s, the starkness of this class difference is somewhat diminished. Many in both classes were then 'keeping themselves', although working-class children living at home were still contributing to the household, while middle-class children were not.

The absence of family demands on many middle-class respondents and the emphasis they placed on a personal social life, clearly suggests an absence of familistic values and an emphasis on the individual rather than the family.

Despite the family demands made of more of my working-class respondents, it is not possible to conclude that they were bound by familistic values. There clearly were young working-class earners using their status as earners to gain more disposable income and greater freedom from domestic chores. Moreover, some parents spontaneously conceded

greater autonomy once their children were 'of age'. Some of the working-class women respondents had least freedom and accepted this without resentment. Here the case for familistic values is strongest, but their own understandings of their behaviour are not reducible to familism alone.

This view is confirmed by discussion of the decision to leave or stay at home. Here I suggest that working-class children, girls as well as boys, were often aware of the view that children had a right to a life of their own, beyond the family of origin. Such a view lays the emphasis on the individual rather than the family.

On the majority of indicators - the choices associated with education, employment, disposition of the wage, and the level of family demands made of young people - among the middle-class, the emphasis is on the individual. This is less clearly so in the case of working-class respondents, although some working-class respondents, at least, were recognised as 'abstract individuals' when they 'came of age'. But working-class and middle-class families certainly do not cluster at opposite ends of a familistic-individualistic continuum. Working-class children did not typically give indefinite service to their parents. To do so was recognised as deviant. Moreover, the middle-class emphasis on the individual did not preclude young people from organising their lives to take on a family responsibility, like looking after their widowed mother.

1. Shorter's view has been explicitly and implicitly criticised by Tilly (Tilly, 1974; Scott and Tilly, 1975; Tilly and Scott, 1978).

2. Betty's father had an accident in the pit which made further work there impossible for him. He got compensation money, eventually, and then bought a horse and cart and started a coal delivering business.

3. When her father came home from the war he asked her to leave as he considered the job 'unsuitable'. Nina left, although she did not understand her father's objection. This was one of a small number of examples of parents taking exception to the nature of the work their daughters were doing.

Another was Nell. Nell worked as a bottler and labeller in a whisky bond. Her father was a religious man, a Baptist and a teetotaler. He did not confront Nell until she had been working there for about a year. He went through her kist and found an empty bottle and realised she was bringing something home and selling it. He said, 'If you're going to keep working in the bonds, get out. Get lodgings somewhere else.' Subsequently Nell's mother helped her find digs. In other words, Nell chose to leave home rather than give up her job.

4. It would be wrong to give the impression that young people rarely had any choice over the work they did. Several respondents changed jobs for their own reasons. For example, Rab got his first job in a sawmill where a

brother worked. However, he hated it because of the noise and after a few weeks said to his mother he was going to leave. Another brother got him a job in the shipyards as a cauker's mate. (Rab, cork cutter's son, born 1905)

Young workers who were dissatisfied with their current job often looked to siblings. Tom and his two older brothers worked with their father down the pit. One of the brothers left because of his health and got a job on the railways. Tom asked him to "put in a word for me and Wullie". They both got jobs starting on Monday, cleaning carriages. Girls too changed jobs in this way.

5. Eric's father died when he was an infant. He was the youngest of four. His mother took paid employment and children did domestic work when they were old enough. By the time Eric was 14 his older siblings had all left home.

6. Barbara was a particular exception. She was the second child of five. Her father was a hospital porter. She left school with the definite idea that she wanted to be a shop assistant: "I just had a notion. I didn't want to go into a factory or anything else like that." (Barbara, hospital porter's daughter, born 1891) Her mother had to make an initial financial outlay: Barbara had to provide her own black dress. Her earnings were only 5/- a week. Indeed, she discovered that the majority of shop assistants came from families which were better off than her own.

A few respondents did do what they wanted to do in spite of their parents having other ideas. I asked Eck if

he discussed with anyone what he would do when he left school.

"Oh, well you took it for granted, like, if you were a miner's son, you was a miner. You didnae haf tae be but the majority of them were. Well, they [his parents] sent me to be an electrician first. 'Ach' I says, 'To hell with this.' Mind I telt you 1/11d a day. It was a' the same tae me. I was getting my meat. But I says, 'Aw I'm no going to stick this.' That's when I went to auld Tam for a job doon the pit and got it." (Eck, miner[contractor]'s son, born 1901)

His parents sent him to be an electrician because 'it's reckoned a good trade'. When further pressed, the main source of Eck's discontent seems to have been his separation from his friends who were all down the pit. Another miner's son had an almost identical story to tell.

7. Florence's parents took her education very seriously. They moved house so as to be closer to a better private school for girls, St Columba's. She thinks her father's main intention in seeing that they were educated was to broaden their intellect. Florence was the oldest of four, three daughters and a son. Her father was a chartered accountant, son of a mathematics teacher. Her mother had been to university.

"My father really had views on education. He himself had had to make his living from a pretty early age but he had taken an interest in art. He went to art school in the evenings when he was still a student and mother of course was interested and saw we had plenty to read and all that sort of thing."

At St Columba's, the headmistress suggested that she go to Cambridge to sit the entrance exam. She did go to Cambridge with her parents' approval. When she finally left Cambridge she started to look around for work. After

an additional year at Glasgow university, hoping for an opening as a meteorologist, Florence gave up this hope and took a teaching post in a private school in Glasgow. She continued living with her parents.

Moirra's father was an Edinburgh lawyer, as was his father. Her parents moved from a dormitory town into the city when she was 14. At this stage, she was transferred from one private school to another, Cranley. Her school teachers encouraged her to go to university to do languages, but she was more interested in music. Her mother suggested going to a school in Germany 'run by two English ladies'. Her mother was keen to take a trip to Germany and travelled there with her. Moirra stayed in Germany for two years.

8. Precisely how the money is handed over is of some interest. Bornat's (Bornat, 1976) respondents from the Colne Valley of West Yorkshire described a system they called 'tipping up', emptying their wages into their mother's apron. My respondents simply talked about handing over their wages or their wage-packet.

9. This section contradicts Stearn's (1972) claim that working-class women typically kept most of their wages. The findings of other researchers (Bornat, 1976; Roberts, 1975 & 1977) collecting oral histories also contradict Stearn's claim.

10. This was true for men I'd interviewed who served apprenticeships and then worked in their trade, with the exception of a baker who worked as such before the First

World War and was earning 28/- in 1912. For a discussion of the wages of skilled men see Burnett (1977).

11. Kate's mother was from a middle-class Dublin family destroyed by the death of one of her parents and the subsequent suicide of the other.

12. Jessie had been taken away from school early in order to help in the house. When she left, her father was then living alone. Two of her three siblings were married and the third went to live with his married sister. At 17 she left her home town and went to be a domestic servant in Edinburgh.

13. Ina was 24 when her mother died and had been married about a year. She had four younger brothers aged 18, 16, 14, and twelve. The older two had already left home. The other two came to live with Ina.

CHAPTER EIGHT

LEARNING TO BE 'HOUSEWIVES' AND 'BREADWINNERS'?

In chapter two, I noted that all the authors discussed there agreed that 'the modern family' is characterised by an exaggeration of sex-role segregation. The essence of the agreement is that the division of married couples into man the earner and women the domestic worker, or in lay terms the division into 'breadwinner' and 'housewife', is a characteristic of the modern family in a way that was not so markedly the case for previous family forms.

For example, this is Parsons' description of the increased division of labour within marriage: 'It is our suggestion that the recent change in the American family itself and in its relation to the rest of society which we have taken as our point of departure, is far from implying an erasure of the differentiation of sex roles; in many respects it reinforces and clarifies it. In the first place, the articulation between family and occupational system in our society focuses the instrumental responsibility for a family very sharply on its one adult male member, and prevents its diffusion through the ramifications of an extended kinship system. Secondly, the isolation of the nuclear family in a complementary way focuses the responsibility of the mother role more sharply on the one adult woman, to a relatively high degree cutting her off from the help of adult sisters and other kinswomen; furthermore, the fact of the absence of the husband-father from the home premises so much of the time means that she

has to take primary responsibility for the children.' (Parsons & Bales, 1956, 23)

As a description of the actual division of labour within the modern family, this statement is not generally regarded as contentious. But where there is disagreement is over the preconditions and the consequences of this sharpening of the division of labour. Setting aside the suggestion of a previous family form in which 'extended kin' formed a unit, a suggestion which the work of historians like Laslett has discredited, the statement also suggests the separation of 'home' and 'work' as a precondition. Many authors assume, with Parsons, that the separation of 'home' and 'work' was critical. Indeed, some seem to regard this as a sufficient precondition. In chapter two, I noted that Hartman criticises Zaretsky for failing to discuss adequately why men end up in 'work' as the earner and women at home as 'housewives'. In chapter four I reviewed recent historical work, on the development of the family wage and the exclusion of women from 'skilled' work, which is attempting to answer this question.

Feminist writers focus on the gender-based division of labour in the family as the keystone of women's subordination today. In the context of the relatively isolated nuclear family, the division of couples into 'housewife' and 'breadwinner' by definition means the economic dependence of the former. The earner always

controls superior economic resources which may be translated into an exercise of power over the houseworker. Since the potential for this exercise of power is always there, the earner may be said to be in a position of power.

This becomes womens' subordination when there is a systematic and 'forced' division of couples into earner and houseworker along gender lines. The maintenance of such a systematic division requires structural and, normally, ideological support: structural support in the sense of pressures in this direction beyond the control of individuals, and an absence of alternatives; ideological support in the sense of ideas which legitimate these structures and their consequences.

Parsons identifies the occupational system as requiring the adaption of families such that one adult worker is absent 'at work' while another stays at home. The only suggestion Parsons makes as to why women typically do the latter is to indicate that the fact that women are biologically equipped to nurse young infants encourages this particular division.

As always with Parsons there is a tantalising mixture of ahistorical functional explanation and hints of the historically specific. If we chose to focus on the latter then this will not do. A scant knowledge of the history of breast feeding and infant care is enough to indicate that actual practice has been extremely varied. This variation makes reference to biological equipment, as an unchanging fact, seem of dubious worth as an explanation. Moreover,

reference to biology alone neglects other structural constraints which 'force' this division of labour. The occupational opportunities of men and women are dissimilar. Women have a different history of opportunity of 'skill', high earnings and security of employment. The 'dual labour market' is an important structural constraint which, at the very least, facilitates the typical gender-specific division of labour at home.

The gender-based division is supported by a set of ideas about appropriate behaviour for men and women. This constellation of ideas not only says what men and women can and ought to do but also attributes greater worth to the doings of men. Thus womens' actual as well as potential contribution is devalued. The actual division of labour and this set of ideas are mutually sustaining not only within the family but also in the workplaces outwith the home. The low paid, low status jobs which women are concentrated in are 'womens' work'.

In terms of this feminist analysis, the history of womens' subordination today is tied to the development of the modern family and, in particular, to the characteristic separation of earner and houseworker. However, authors writing about the development of 'the modern family' take rather different positions with respect to the consequences for women of the gender based division of labour.

Some argue that women gained, if not in equality with men, then in satisfaction. Shorter must take this position

since he believes that middle-class women were the first permitted to express feelings of maternal love and domesticity, otherwise obliterated by everyday toil. Donzelot argues that working-class women willingly adopted the division of labour the middle class wished to 'impose' on them because it was an improvement on their previous situation. It was an improvement in the sense that women now had a sphere of influence, the domestic, which was exclusively theirs to rule, whereas previously they had none.

The majority of authors, like Parsons, note that with the creation of women's domestic sphere the role of wife and mother acquired a new importance. Rather than declaring this new importance attributed to women's work a gain, however, it is declared a mixed blessing. Parsons refers to the strains involved in the female role. Zaretsky notes that woman's new role involved exclusion from other spheres of influence and consolidated her dependence on men. In the view of several authors the disadvantages were temporary because associated changes would undermine the gender-based hierarchy, if not division of labour.

Lasch, Stone, and Aries all note that the increased concern with childrearing and the quality of mothering fed concern for the education of women. Better education for women reduced the gap between men and women in certain sectors of the population. Authors who discuss the growth of individualism and its impact on the family invariably

note the tendency of individualism to undermine 'natural' authority of age and sex. The stress on each individual as unique and valuable tends to undermine appeals to 'natural' authority.

Whatever the position adopted with respect to the consequences of the familial division of labour for the relative power of men and women, and their relative satisfaction, the accounts focus on married men and women. The fact that a shift for married women towards a more narrowly defined role in the confines of the privatised and enclosed nuclear family will have implications for women at other stages of the life cycle is often unexplored. Although it can be assumed from the accounts that women in the earlier stage of the life cycle, which is the subject of my writing, will be focused on a future as wife and mother in a way that was not previously the case, details of this process are not offered by the majority of authors discussed. Many analysts of the contemporary family offer accounts of the process of socialisation into gender roles but few historians have dealt in detail with changes in gender socialisation accompanying the development of the modern family.

In this chapter I will look at the extent to which boys and girls were socialised into earners and housewives in my respondents' families. When I talk of socialisation I am talking about the shaping of predispositions: this includes a heightened awareness of particular aspects of

life, the acquisition of 'appropriate' attitudes and a knowledge of 'appropriate' behaviour. I am, therefore, looking for strands of experience which help shape and maintain gender-specific predispositions consistent with the division into 'housewife' and 'breadwinner'. I assume that socialisation into 'housewives' and 'breadwinners' will be more powerful if experiences consistent with this division occur at several levels of everyday life. Thus 'strong' socialisation would include gender-specific experience in all rather than one of the following: what people actually do, what specific others expect of them, what popular ideas indicate they ought to do, what institutional structures permit, and what they see others as doing.

I recognise that socialisation is not a one-stage process: it is a distorting over-simplification to view attitudes as formed at an early age and carried around thereafter. Like Berger and others, I note that we do not bring an unchangeable past to the present; rather we constantly reinterpret our past in light of the present. But in the scramble for a dynamic model of how people's consciousness is shaped, there is an opposite danger of denying any influence of the past. I prefer to err in the direction of over-solidifying the past.

My own data are a set of memories. In this chapter I am using these memories of childhood and young adulthood to say something abstract about the child's future. I talk about the extent to which childhood and young adulthood

experiences could be regarded as some form of preparation for the gender division in marriage of husband-earner, wife-houseworker. I do not pretend to begin describing adequately the dynamic of these layers of past, present and future. Rather than attempting to present a dynamic model, I simply look for experience consistent with or in opposition to this division of labour among young people. An influence on the future is implied.

I look first at the extent to which differences in the activities of girls and boys, young men and women were consistent with the gender-based division of labour. I then look for expectations and explicit training which encouraged the adoption of the roles of 'housewife' and 'breadwinner'. And finally I ask to what extent parents provided an example of this division.

Having done this I look at the issue of women's subordination. I move beyond the division of labour into houseworker and earner and look for evidence of different resources at the disposal of boys and girls, young men and women.

Experience of doing housework and earning while young

I look first, then, at what girls and boys, young men and women did in terms of housework and earning. In working-class households girls can be seen to do more housework and boys to do more earning, although some qualification of this observation is necessary. As noted in the chapter on 'child-centredness' almost all working-

class school girls and young working women did some housework, but this was true of less than half the boys. At the same time over half of working-class school boys had part-time jobs, while this was true of less than half of the girls. At this level of doing, a less clear case can be made in terms of middle-class respondents. Again in some households girls helped with housework and boys did not. In some neither girls nor boys contributed to the household either by doing housework or financially. At this simple level of who does what with reference to housework and earning, gender differences are not exhausted by noting the proportions of males and females participating in each type of work. When comparing male and female contributions in either sphere the distribution of hours spent and types of tasks done also varies.

Housework: working-class children and young earners

In the case of housework there was a range of tasks that were often delegated to children, such as shopping, cleaning shoes, cleaning cutlery, polishing brasses. In some households these tasks were done only by girls but in most households they were children's rather than girls jobs. But the heavier and more difficult housework tasks like cooking, washing, and floor scrubbing, were usually delegated only to daughters and much more rarely done by men. George, the youngest in the family, describes the traditional Friday night cleaning.

"Friday night was always a night that was a cleaning night. And after you came home from school, if you weren't going out with the milk [delivering milk], you went the messages

for the Saturday. And that was the night you cleaned the house. Everyone of us had their part to play, in those days. There was no linoleum like what it is now, just the bare boards, and these boards had to be scrubbed with what they called silver sand. Dry-scrubbed, and then you went over it with the water. These boards would be smooth. You'd think they'd varnished it. And after the floors were washed - my sisters, they did the washing of the floors - the newspapers were put down and woe betide you if you dirtied the floor. It was like that for the Saturday." (George, born 1900, foreman porter's son)

Some tasks - digging the garden, fetching the coal and, in some households, washing the windows - were more likely to be done by boys. But this did not balance the division of labour. Some girls and young women spent very long hours doing housework, but this was not so for men. Maggie explains that she could not take part-time employment while at school because of her commitment to housework.

"No, I never had a chance 'cause my mother was oot working. I had to be in the hoose with the bairns, washing and everything at 12 and 13 years old." (Maggie, born 1899, docker's daughter)

Also there are instances of girls leaving school early to adopt the role of full-time houseworkers but no instances of male full-time houseworkers.

Girls usually continued to do some housework once earning. Even if they were living and working away from home they could be expected to make a contribution in their time off. Mary for example, was a shop assistant living with a woman who kept a small 'Jenny a' Things'. She worked very long hours but had a half day: "Sometimes I wished that I hadnae. I had to go home to my mother's and do washing." Her mother made more demands on her than was

usual but some contribution to housework was typically expected of young women. This was not usually true for boys.

My data suggests that girls were expected to leave school early in response to family crisis more often than boys. This is because of the idea that the main domestic labourer, the housekeeper, could only be a woman, whereas all could contribute to income. Thus if the father died, any member of the family, who was old enough to earn, could do so. The surviving mother could go out to work, without depending on outside help, provided at least one child was old enough to tend to the rest. If, on the other hand, the mother died, of the surviving personnel only a daughter could take her place. Not surprisingly, then, it seems that there was more often pressure on daughters to become housekeepers than on sons to become earners.

Earning: working-class children

In the case of earning, the range of work exhibited by boys was somewhat greater and yet there was one type of work done by girls and not boys. That was scrubbing stairs and cleaning other people's houses for money. For some girls, then, there was an overlap between doing housework and earning. Belle, for example did housework at home, was paid for housework by a neighbour and was paid for delivering milk.

"I washed stairs, [for] a man who worked beside my father, and his wife died. I got sixpence and that was a lot of money for washing the stair. So he said, 'Will you scrub the bunker?'. It was a great big white bunker. It was a Friday: I had to go up and scrub the bunker and scrub the

floor, brown linoleum on the floor. And I got a shilling if I done the kitchen bunker and my mother got the shilling." (Belle, born 1900, shoemaker's daughter)

The data do not permit exact quantification of hours spent in paid employment, but more working-class boys than girls worked for shops, delivering and doing back-shop work, which tended to mean long hours. As far as the distribution of hours spent can be examined, it seems that a larger proportion of boys spend long hours earning. Although girls were more likely to spend long hours in housework and boys more likely to spend long hours earning, there is not a symmetry in gender difference in who did what in working-class schoolchildren. All girls and some boys did housework but not all boys were earners.

Housework and earning: middle-class children

In many middle-class households children had almost no experience of either domestic work or earning. Not only did they have no responsibility for the round of chores which maintained the household, but some upper middle-class girls were not even responsible for managing their appearance until they were relatively old. Caroline went to boarding school when she was eleven years old.

"Well, I was very homesick really. And I'd never been taught to dress myself or do my hair. It had all been done for me, you know. And I remember I couldn't do my hair the first day at boarding school. I had long hair then and the other girls were very disgusted in my bedroom. They had to do it for me, you know. So at the half term, at their request, I had it bobbed." (Caroline, born 1910, mill owners daughter)

The management of a boy's appearance did not require such effort. Boys, for example, did not have to learn to do

their hair in the same way.

As noted in chapter five, in some middle-class households girls did do domestic work, but not in households where mother did none. As in working-class households, further discussed below, domestic work was not typically undertaken as a conscious training in domestic arts, but rather as a practical necessity.

"We all had our jobs to do, bedrooms to keep clean, to help with the dishes, because it was a huge house. Well, we had two [maids] to begin with." (Rachel, born 1899, minister's daughter)

Indeed, girls were sometimes discouraged from cooking and baking because they were not up to their mother's standard, which suggests that giving daughters a training in domestic work was not a high priority.

The phrase "all had our jobs to do" suggests boys as well as girls, but boys were often exempt. This was the case in Alexander's family. His family was unusual because of the absence of domestic servants, although a maid would have been possible on his father's salary of 300 pounds per annum. It was his mother and his sisters who kept their large house.

For those who did no domestic work as children, experience born out of necessity could come quite late in life. Those who went away to university were catered for by others. Similarly, those who went into employment away from home often lived in digs or clubs.

Thus, in middle-class households the pattern of activities of young people was not so systematically

consistent with a gender-based division of labour. In some households girls did housework and boys did none, but boys were never out earning while girls were doing housework. If employed and living at home some middle-class daughters did on occasions contribute to the housework, but typically less routinely and substantially than working-class daughters.

Parental expectations, demands and explicit training

The potential part played by early patterns of doing these activities in the socialisation of boys into earners and girls into housewives is strengthened if associated with ideas about who should do what and who will do what in the future.

In the chapter on 'child-centredness' I moved away from this limited behavioural measure, who does what, to ask whether working-class parents pressured their school children into housework and part-time earning. The answer was that a child's housework was typically a response to parental demand whereas part-time work was more typically initiated by the child. Thus parental involvement in the initiation of doing housework and earning indicates that girls are typically pressured into housework, but it does not indicate that boys are typically pressured into earning.

In chapter five I suggested that in many working-class households children of the period were regarded as at the service of adults. Thus parents were seen as having a right to *expect and command* children to do things that would lighten their own burden

and the burden of any other adult parents wish to assist. However, the only sphere of work which parents typically controlled directly was the domestic sphere.

Paid employment, in contrast, is not typically directly controlled by parents, their friends, relatives or neighbours. A small number of respondents were brought up in households where parents did run their own business and could demand service of children at their own place of employment. Children brought up in these households were among the hardest worked out of school hours of all respondents.

But in most cases the only way children could be of service other than through domestic work was by independently bringing home a wage or other valuables. This is a much more indirect form than doing housework of diminishing the burden of work for adults. Also it minimises an important component of serving: the expression of deference.

Thus in most households there was really only one form of service available, domestic work. But not all work was regarded as appropriate for both boys and girls in this sphere. In many households large portions of domestic work were regarded as women's work, only to be done by a man in the complete absence of a women, if at all.

The idea that some work is women's work was illustrated by many respondents. Men often described their childhood involvement in housework with the explanatory

addendum that they had no sisters. Similarly other men explained their lack of participation with reference to their sisters.

The situation in which much housework is regarded as women's work and girls do more housework than boys encourages girls to accept, as theirs, the responsibility for domestic work. Because certain tasks were only appropriate for girls, the pressure on daughters to do housework carried much moral weight. Daughters were more often in a position of knowing that, if they did not do the work, there was no one else who could do it. In this sense, of encouraging acceptance for the responsibility for housework, we can talk of socialisation into the role of housewife.

Obviously, girls received more training-through-doing in housework than did boys. Mothers typically supervised or inspected any domestic work children did, boy or girl. Often a certain standard was asserted as how things had to be done.

"I can mind the first time I done the stair. I was sorry I ever offered. It was a wooden stair, you see. Here I hadnae done it to my mother's liking and she came oot and looked at it. She says, 'No, Ina! That's no right. No. You'll get a knife wi' ye and you get into the corners.' I says, 'Well I didnae know I had to dae that'. 'Well', she says, 'You do a thing, you do it right.'" (Ina, born 1904, brass finisher's daughter)

Since girls did more housework they learned more of these standards of housework.

Explicit training as a 'housewife'

There was little direct and purposive socialisation

into the future role of housewife. For example, when and how girls learned typically had to do with the needs of the household, rather than a systematic training programme in housewifery. It was not rare for events to result in a working-class girl of 13 or 14 having a heavy burden of housework thrust upon her. Girls of that age had not typically been taught how to cook or do the washing. Rather they learned on the job. Agnes, for example, when first keeping house mainly made mince and tatties because it was easy. She had a disaster with her first washing:

"I remember the first washing I did. I used to have to stand on a stool. [It was] a great big wooden tub. One day I was washing sheets. [I was] 12 years old. And I thought to myself, 'Well I'll get some chloride of lime.' That was stuff we used to use long ago. And I sprinkled it on the top of the sheets in the pot. Put the pot in the fire to boil them to wash them. When I took the sheets out they're a' in ribbons! I'd put too much in." (Agnes, born 1894, iron moulder and miner's daughter)

Many working-class mothers needed or wanted a lot of domestic backup and therefore trained their children on the job. Others did not need or want a great deal of domestic help and restricted their demands to traditional children's tasks. In both cases requests and demands were often focused on girls rather than boys.

But some mothers did involve their daughters in what they were doing. Jane's mother was an example.

"If mother was baking she would give us a little bit of dough and a bottle for a rolling pin, and showed us how to roll out scones. As we got on [older] we had to make the dough ourselves and do it." (Jane, born 1899, engine driver's daughter)

Hatty's mother is a rather different example. Her training was not limited to techniques in cooking and housework but

also advice about managing money.

"Mother used to say, 'Well, it will no be my fault if you dinae turn out to be a good wife'. We tain our teaching off my mother, that you had to do right. If you were going to get married you had to do the right thing. And my mother when we were getting married used to say to us, 'Now, remember never take on but what your husband knows. Never. If you feel you need anything, save up for it and wait till you've got the money to buy it. But if you feel you need it and you've no got the money, tell your husband. Get his opinion before you do anything.' And she used to say to us, 'There's one thing you've got to remember when you get married. See that you pay your rent and that you pay your way, your societies. Never let that go out. See that you pay your rent, even if you have to live on bread and margarine.'" (Hatty, born 1902, seaman's daughter)

Hatty's mother not only outlines the priorities when deciding what is to be paid but also lays down rules for how the decision to make a new purchase should be made, emphasising consultation with the husband, despite the constant absence of her own seaman and her relative independence from him. Perhaps she had a grasp of an ideal division of labour which was more powerful than her own reality.

Few women, working-class or middle-class, remember such detailed advice from their mother. Few mothers adopted this role of consciously educating their daughters for a future as a wife. Several mothers, including middle-class mother's like Moira's - "my mother wasn't very keen on my attempts at cookery" - preferred to do things themselves than have their daughters do them more slowly and less satisfactorily. It may be that mothers often simply did not have the energy to give explicit instruction in domestic skills but the evidence also suggest it was not

typically regarded as important to do so.

For most daughters, any knowledge of the management of money, as with housework, was through doing and seeing rather than advice about a future role of wife and mother. Some children and many young working women and men were encouraged to save by their parents and had post office savings books or some other form of bank. "You'll learn the value of money" was commonly said to young people when they started to "keep themselves". As noted earlier, fewer women than men did "keep themselves", however, and thus fewer had this direct experience.

Expectations and training as earners

Working-class parents typically expected girls as well as boys to keep themselves in work. Jean, for example, received rather ironic encouragement from her father not long after she started in the hosiery factory at 14.

"I was feeling very sorry for myself one morning having to go out to work. Father gave me a friendly smack and said, 'Come on, Jean! Any fool can laugh at night but it takes a man to laugh in the morning.'" (Jean, born 1895, cabinet maker's daughter)

At the same time it was generally accepted that young working-class women would give up work on marriage. Several respondents remarked that married women did not get to keep their jobs. Some commented that women "expected men to keep them in those days". In chapter five I noted that in some families it was thought to be "terrible" if a married woman worked. Similar findings are recorded by Roberts (1977). There was no doubt considerable local variation in the precise combination of occupational

constraints, expectations and social pressures operating against work by married women (Taylor, 1977; Gittins, 1982).

Young working-class men and women who were bringing a wage into their parent's home were often not ~~the~~ breadwinner. But young women straddled the categories 'breadwinner' and 'housewife' in a way that men did not. In many households mothers wanted or could not manage without the assistance of their daughters, and yet, once aged 14, working-class daughters were usually also earners. For some young women this was difficult to reconcile. Belle, for example, directed her complaint about the division of housework against her sister Dot who was at home full-time.

"But Peg [sister] was the best worker of the lot to my mother. Even though we were working from six to eight at night in Alder McKae's [munitions, Edinburgh] she'd say, 'Come on, we're the first served, we'll wash up to save my mother. Mother's leg is awfie sore. Come on!' [I said,] 'Peg, it's unfair. We're in the factory all day.' 'Oh come on, but it helps your mother!' And we'd a single sister, Dot. She was supposed to keep the house. She'd be sitting reading." (Belle, born 1900, shoemaker's daughter)

Belle did not take for granted that the idea that daughters should do housework, because they were daughters, and sons should not because housework was women's work. However, she treats the division between earner and full-time houseworker as unproblematic. Indeed, it is this division that Belle appealed to, when complaining about housework. And yet, because it was taken for granted that a full-time houseworker could only be a woman, this

division made it possible for brothers to see housework as women's work.

As noted earlier, upper middle-class daughters were often not expected to work, but many middle-class daughters, like middle-class sons, took it for granted that they would be earning. The difference, however, is that not all daughters took it for granted that this would lead to them supporting themselves. Some, like Moira, had this in mind as a conscious aim; others, like Catherine, quoted in chapter five, thought of it rather more as earning spending money.

"We were all anxious to go out and earn some money. I wouldn't say our livelihood, but some money. It was mostly pocket-money what we earned." (Catherine, born 1902, commercial traveller's daughter)

Thus many middle-class daughters never expected to be 'breadwinners', and working-class daughters never unequivocally inhabited that category but also had to be part-time houseworkers. The expectations of both working-class and middle-class girls concerning their future as earners were typically compatible with adopting the role of the woman at home, on marriage.

If girls were given little explicit training in the role of housewife, were boys or working-class girls explicitly socialised into earning? Again the evidence suggests that few parents consciously set about fitting their child for the role of earner. But some parents did explicitly stress the importance of having and keeping a job. Wullie's father was an example:

"There wasnae the absenteeism then as what there is today. My father was very strict on that and he was very strict on your time for your job. You had to be there on time. And as far as he was concerned, everything was alright with you as long as you were working. As long as you were employed you were alright. Even till the day he died. Well I had a wee idle spell [in the early 30s]. He was in hospital at the time. Even then [he asked] 'Are you working?' That was the thing that was on his mind. It didnae matter what pay you were getting - as long as you were working he thought everything was alright."

Many parents encouraged work discipline indirectly by discouraging late nights and the consumption of alcohol. Often discouragement of both was couched in general moral terms. It was simply what respectable folk did not do. When he was 19 Jamie's mother attacked late nights on the grounds that they were bad for his health.

"There used to be whist drives and dances that cost about 2/6d. I went to one. I had to ask if I could go, you see, because it was a late night till 12 o'clock, Friday night. About three months later I said to my mother, 'Can I go to another whist drive?'. She said, 'You've been at one there in November.' This was about February. I says, 'That was about 3 months ago.' She says, 'Well, you can go, but remember you are burning the candle at both ends.' Late nights, you see. Two late nights in the winter were too much for me." (Jamie, born 1902, tailor's son)

Discouragement of late nights and the consumption of alcohol contributed to the socialisation of young people into earners, without that necessarily being anyone's explicit intention. Although there may have been an image of a 'good earner' as a sober, early bedder, the activities which were inimical to this image, were frowned on more in women than men. Parents, in both middle-class and working-class families, were often less tolerant of daughters keeping late nights. Drinking, like smoking, was more stigmatised for women than men.

Respondent's parents as role models

In addition to experience through doing, and exposure to attitudes about the division of labour and explicit advice about a future role (wife and mother), learning can also take place by seeing, by example.

All took for granted the division of labour between parents which exempted father from most domestic work. Most fathers did do little or no domestic work. A few working-class patriarchs expected a high level of personal service from wife and children. Wullie's father, for example, had the paper read to him every night by his wife, despite the fact that he could read himself. Meanwhile the children had to be silent if they were in the house. Bill's father, quoted in chapter five, who never spoke to his children in the house, was a more extreme example. "And if he wanted a cup of tea he rattled his spoon in his saucer for my sister to pour out his second cup of tea." (Bill, born 1903, mason/builder's son.)

Men like Bill's father did no domestic work. But some working-class men did do work in and/or for the house, besides earning wages. Gardening or tending an allotment and fetching coal were the most common such tasks but shoe mending, and other forms of do-it-yourself were not rare. Bessie's father, a foreman in a sawmill, was exceptional. Bessie knew he was exceptional and settled on the fact that her father was English as the explanation:

"Father wouldn't think twice about going out and scrubbing the wooden stair or cleaning the windows. He was always a good cook. He would never allow mother to put coal on the

fire as she was dressmaking."

Although it was rare for a father to do much domestic work and unknown for him to be a full-time houseworker, working-class women were not similarly exempt from earning. A substantial minority of respondents had mothers who had paid work. In many cases mothers worked because of the absence of an earning man but also often because his earnings were inadequate. Thus Maggie's mother was working in a laundry to supplement her docker husband's wage. Hatty's mother preferred to go out and earn herself than draw on her seaman husband's wages through the shipping office. And yet the range of paid work open to married women was very limited. As Davy put it, "The only work my mother could get was charring. Industry wouldn't take married women." This is something of an overstatement but not far from the truth. One mother sorted for a paper and metal merchant, another made up bundles of firewood, but the majority were cleaning or doing some other form of domestic work.

Thus some working-class women were earners as well as houseworkers. For middle-class children this blurring of the division of parents into man the earner and woman the homemaker was more unusual. The only example among my respondents was Liz's mother, a widow, who worked full-time as post mistress of a sub-post office, initially part of their home. Middle-class married women rarely had paid employment.

Conclusion

Working-class girls and young women had done more housework than boys in a context in which much domestic work was seen as women's work. A similar view of domestic work as 'women's work' was characteristic of many middle-class households, but here some, though not all, girls and young women were protected from housework by paid 'help' and mother.

Working-class girls were not allowed to abandon housework, once earning. Middle-class girls were often not expected to earn to contribute to the house or, ultimately, to 'keep themselves', but rather expected to remain dependent on father until marriage.

In a few instances girls had been given advice about how to be a good wife in the future, but explicit training was rare. Similarly very few parents gave explicit advice about how to be a good earner. At the same time parents exhibited a division of labour in the direction of man the earner and women the houseworker, but with deviations.

This set of experiences, and taken-for-granted views could add up to a powerful predisposition among women to accept responsibility for the domestic sphere. It has proved more difficult to document complementary pressures on men.

The 'abstract individual' and gender revisited

In the last chapter I argued that girls as well as boys typically recognised themselves as individuals with a right to lives of their own. In the case of middle-class

daughters the 'degrees of freedom' were set by what was 'suitable' for a young woman of that class. In the case of working-class daughters, the needs of the household were sometimes allowed to prevail, by the daughter. I argued that this was not evidence of an absence of individualism, since explanation was usually in terms of choosing to do so because of 'love of mother', rather than duty to family.

Several authors have suggested that individualism undermines 'natural' authority of old over young and men over women. In this section I wish to look again at the resources of young men and women, and their freedom and autonomy.

Above I have presented evidence which suggests that girls were being predisposed towards a future role as 'housewife'. Much of the experience of boys and girls, young men and women was consistent with the division into 'housewife' and 'earner'. I now wish to ask to what extent this experience involved a sense of and acceptance of women as subordinate to men.

If power is regarded as control over resources, then young men typically had more power than women. Within both working-class and middle-class families boys and young men were often in a position of having more resources, specifically time and money, at their disposal than girls and young women. Differences in resources were often created or exacerbated by the intervention of parents.

Differences between schoolboys and schoolgirls were

not as marked as differences between older offspring. Some working-class boys with part-time jobs did have more pocket money, but most still only received coppers. As established full-time workers, of course, young men often earned more than young women. The difference between the wages of young men and women at age 20 is reflected in the portioning out of the wage. It was not rare for a young man to have more in his pocket than he had contributed to the house. It was extremely rare for a young woman to be in this situation.

In the last chapter I discussed the system of 'keeping yourself': for women this more often meant an increase in pocket money than paying digs. This difference is not simply a consequence of the different wage levels of male and female workers, but it was certainly supported by it.

Some parents seemed to believe that boys needed more money than girls, although this was not made explicit. In fact, when young men and women 'went out' the former often paid, so that the roles of earner and dependant were partially adopted by young couples. It was this practice to which Kate's referred in the previous chapter, when commenting on her lack of pocket money: "It's a good job I always had boyfriends."

Belle, who was earning good money in munitions, complained that her brothers got more pocket money than she and her sister.

"Mind, the laddies got off better than what we did. My mother slipped them money for cigarettes that we never got. I used to cast up to my mother. I said, 'Mother I'm only

getting sixpence for a week's pocket money and your slipping the boys.' They used to go to a keep fit club over in St Mary's Street. It was a good boys' club then and the boys were great. That's when they started boxing but they started smoking as well. One was a bricklayer, one was a joiner and one was a painter. But my mother used to slip them money. My father used to say, 'Now don't give these boys money.' And my mother would cough away. [Brother] Jock would say, 'Well mother we'll no be in to about ten.' The laddies didn't bother when they came in. My mother used to just slip them the money. I used to say, 'And I'm only getting sixpence a week.'" (Belle, shoemaker's daughter, born 1900)

Both boys and girls typically had to be home by a set time. Betty's father illustrates the lack of discrimination. He was a miner on night shift. He would start walking to his work at nine o'clock in order to get there for ten. He wanted all his children home before he left.

"He used to warn every one of us. Of course we werenae out very often, but there was the two brothers - they were older ... we werenae very far from the pictures, and they used to, this Michael especially. He got a wee part-time job in a grocer's shop and he'd use his tips, whatever he got. He wouldnae get much and his wages weren't much either. I think he used to get 5/- a week or 4/-. He was the greatest one. He slipped to the pictures. Well he wasnae in at nine. ... It was very seldom that that happened because he got a leathering the next day."

Despite frequent equality in bedtimes, while at school, time as a resource was generally more restricted for girls, because all girls had to participate in housework.

In the case of young workers, men typically had more free time at their disposal because they did not retain responsibility for housework once earning. The difference was exacerbated by parental intervention. Parents continued to exercise some authority over how young earners might spend their 'free' time and money. Daughters were

typically rather more restricted by parents than sons. Middle-class parents similarly restricted their daughters to a greater extent than their sons.

In most working-class families young women - and often also young men - were expected to be home by a set time even into their late teens and early twenties. "Going to the dancing" was a popular entertainment on Friday and Saturday night. Young people were typically expected to come straight home often a long walk from the dance.

"You weren't allowed out late. You had to be in by a certain time. Usually had to be back by ten if the dance finished at nine. Mother was standing with a spurkle ready to hit us over the hied if we were late back." (Nancy, born 1901, miner's daughter)

A third of the working-class men I interviewed had a key to their parents' house while they were living there. These men were more likely to say that you could come and go as you pleased once you were in your 20s. Some regarded 21 as the traditional age at which people got a key, others had actually had a key before then. No substantial minority of young women had keys to their parents' house.

The quote from Nancy indicates that not only was she given a set time to be home by but also her mother checked to see if she was home then and punished her if she was not. This was not uncommon in the case of girls. Some parents were also watchful of boys, that is aware of when they did come in at night. Parents may have had rather different specific worries about sons and daughters. Thus some parents were concerned to establish that sons were sober.

"Mother, even when we were fully grown men, if one of us was out she never could sleep. I think it was the responsibility wi' my father being killed."

It was rare, although not unknown, for working sons to be beaten for coming home late.

Parents were generally rather more watchful of girls than boys. If a women was walked home by a man, and lingered talking to him, parents would often intervene. Jean was coming home from choir practice, her only late night out:

"I remember one night I was standing with one of the boys of the choir, we were just standing. I don' know what we were talking about, at the foot of the stair. She (mother) came down and called me up. She says, 'Come on Jean, it's about time you were up the stair.' So when I got up she says, 'It's no nice for young lassies standing at the foot of the stair at night.'" (Jean, born 1895, cabinet maker's daughter)

Much of the closer watch parents kept on girls than boys must be viewed in the context of the double standard in sexual conduct, and parental fear of pregnancy and concern for the reputation of their daughter.

The differential treatment of sons and daughters that is associated with the double standard in sexual conduct was much more than just a greater watchfulness over when daughter came home at night. Various activities, namely smoking, drinking and wearing make up, were associated with prostitutes, 'loose women', and guarded against in daughters.

From 17 or 18 Maggie like dressing up for the dancing. This involved defiance of her mother who objected to her using powder leaf, having an open necked blouse and wearing

earings.

"I remember one night we were going up to the dance, my chum and I, and here's my mum and dad coming up the street. Jeanie says, 'Maggie, here's your mother'. I didnae ken whether tae pit my hand on my neck or my earrings. She just came ower and said, 'Listen, when you come hame, take what you're goin'tae get. And get hame quick.' I was terrified. I used to run and hide my face. I used to say 'You can hit me where you like - you are no touching my face!' She ae tore the hat off my heid. She kent that hurt me. I had a new hat nearly every week. The chaps used to say, 'Dinnae take Maggie hame. Her mother's ae waiting on her.'"

It was not uncommon for parents to be much more cautious in where they allowed daughters to go as opposed to sons. Jenny was not allowed to go on holiday with her friend when she was 18. Her friend's mother rented a cottage each year for a fortnight. Jenny's mother wanted to know how many brothers her friend had and how many rooms there were in the cottage. A few parents did not like their daughters dancing. Jessie's father never liked her going. He would chase her home and sometimes lock her in.

"I used to go to the dancing and hide at the back. There used to be a big public park and the band used to play every night up at the public park and the dancing was in the band hall. I used to get all thingamied up and go into the dance hall. The old fellow used to come doon and pull me oot. I used to hide at the back of the laddies and they used to say, 'Jessie's no here'." (Jessie, born 1897, ironmoulder and miner's daughter)

Jessie was not the only woman to defy a parental ban on dancing. The nearest and only equivalent example of a young man being hauled out of somewhere by his father is the following:

"My father [a miner] was the best detective in the country. My two brothers were at it [involved in the local gambling schooll], of course. He told them he would get them. They shifted their haunts but he walked right into them. ...

Aye! ... he belted them." (Tom, born 1897, miner's son)

Women could often give examples of specific parties they had not been allowed to go to. Bessie's father had a generalised dislike of her "going in a crowd". She used to go to "surprise parties" with women from her work but would tell her parents she was going for a walk. On one occasion her brother wanted her to make up a foursome with him, his girlfriend and his male friend. Permission had to be sought by devious means.

"My brother was friendly with somebody. He sent her up one time to ask if I could go to the Alhambra [picture-house in Leith Walk, Edinburgh]." (Bessie, 1896, labourer's daughter)

Middle-class women, both of school age and into their young adulthood were typically more restricted by parents than their brothers. For example, when I asked Robert if he had to be home by a specific time when at school she said:

"Not me. The girls in the family, yes. I mean, I used to go to the Literary Association meeting at the school on Friday nights. If I got home before 12 o'clock, jolly good. But the girls had to be in by nine o'clock, or else." (Robert, born 1898, son of owner/manager of nursery)

In extreme cases young middle-class women were never unaccompanied by 'suitable' others. Emily, for example, when she went from Edinburgh to spend a year in London with her aunt, took it for granted that she would be accompanied on the journey. She was 19 years old at the time.

"The wife of a friend of my father's was going to London too, so we [she and her parents] chose that day and I travelled with her. I didn't go by myself and my uncle met me. And I was never out alone in London except perhaps at local shops. He [uncle] used to send his office boy for me to take me to town for him, to take me round, to show me

places, like the Tower of London. But, I mean, there was always an office boy. I never went out alone then. You didn't go about alone and never came home alone. My father always came for us if we were at friends' houses in the evening. But of course that was the generation." (Emily, born 1888, stockbroker's daughter)

Again, the greater concern to keep women removed from any possible sexual contact is expressed in examples middle-class women gave of parents' fears that they might "compromise themselves". Elizabeth was never as restricted as Emily. As a child she was allowed to play in the streets of her suburban neighbourhood. However, she gave examples of situations which were disapproved of by her mother as potentially compromising.

"... one night when we'd been playing and came home very late, and my aunt was sent to look for me and she found me coming along the road with a boy's arm round my shoulders. We must have been about 12 or 13 if that. And my friend's little brother was with us. And I said that I thought it was alright because he was there. This was not to be allowed again. My mother was very much afraid that you would compromise yourself in any way. There was one big family of girls where we were in England [she moved to near Manchester at age 13] who all had their boyfriends. And they were thought to be a very nice family but you just didn't have too much to do with them, because they all had their boyfriends." (Elizabeth, born 1897, commercial traveller's daughter)

In her early 20's she was corresponding with a young man, a "family friend", a son of friends of her parents. She said of her relationship with him:

"We didn't meet often enough because he was in Edinburgh and I was in England but we corresponded, especially the year I was in France he wrote to me quite often. And the following year I was told of his engagement to a girl in Edinburgh. My mother's remark was, 'I hope you didn't write the last letter to him.' And I said, 'How did I know? I didn't know that he was going about with a girl in Edinburgh. Even if I had written the last letter it would have been because he didn't answer me.' But I would have been compromised if I had written the last letter."

The last example illustrates how elaborate the rules of conduct were for a middle-class young woman developing a heterosexual relationship. Behaviour was compromising if it invited inappropriate intimacy. To write a letter to an engaged man was to invite inappropriate intimacy, even if you did not know he was engaged. The example illustrates the appropriateness of the term "double standard" by showing how an application of the rules can only result in the compromising and shaming of the woman, not the man.

In summary, in both middle-class and working-class families the direction of difference between male and female children was such that women had less resources with which to express their freedom and more constraints or more restricted 'degrees of freedom' in which to express themselves. Boys and men tended to have more time and money to spend and less interference from parents concerning how they might spend it. The sources of the difference are several and are complexly interrelated. The fact that men typically earned more than women and that certain domestic work was regarded as women's work gave young men more resources than women and was consistent with the division of people into man the earner and woman the houseworker. The difference in resources facilitated the acting out of 'earner and dependant' when young men and women were seeking partners. The norms of sexual conduct, particularly the relative ease with which a woman's reputation could be damaged, further restricted women to a greater degree than men.

In some cases, the greater restrictions placed on women indicated their greater subordination to parents and their greater dependence on parents. The fact that it was more appropriate for girls to serve their parents than boys indicates a significant difference between boys and girls. Those who serve are subordinate.

For some, particularly those middle-class women who accepted that women do not 'work', dependence on parents could only be transferred in marriage, not eradicated. Again this dependence is consistent with the systematic division of men into earners and women into dependent houseworkers.

Women did not always talk about the domestic division of labour between themselves and their brothers in a way which indicated taken-for-granted systematic gender hierarchy. They either noted that some, typically their brothers, did less or noted that everyone was making a contribution to the household, as if unaware of systematic gender difference between brothers and sisters.

When girls were aware that boys did less than them, the awareness was typically accompanied by a recognition that boys were more privileged than girls. This recognition was sometimes accompanied by anger but often by resignation. For example, Nancy said of her brothers.

"They were more pampered. You just took it in your stride. You had to or you got a slap across the jaw."

In some families the hierarchical distance between the position of girls and the position of boys was great. Mary

said of her brothers:

"They didn't have to do anything in the house. We used to have to wash out their white gloves and clean their patent shoes to let them out to the dancing. They were the apple of my mother's eye. Nothing could go wrong with the boys."

Mary sees the different privileges of her brothers as a consequence of unfair favouritism, the result of her mother's excessive devotion to her sons. The social factors fostering that devotion are unanalysed and it remains an explanation in terms of individual motives. This form of analysis was common to women who complained about differences between themselves and their brothers. The asymmetry between boys and girls could be as great in middle-class families. Although some girls, like boys, were not asked to serve parents, girls were often very much more restricted than boys. Since girls were less often directly servicing their brothers, however, asymmetry was perhaps less likely to be felt as hierarchy.

The recognition and acceptance that boys were more privileged could foster a generalised acceptance that women were typically subordinate to men. But women did not talk in such general and abstract terms. Regardless of their general perceptions of "the position of women", however, by their early 20s men and women of both classes had bundles of experience, put together from different levels of experience, which could support the division into male "breadwinner" and female "housewife". In terms of a feminist analysis, predisposition to accept this division is an important aspect of accepting a hierarchy between men

and women.

CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSION

I must warn the reader at the beginning of this chapter that I am not going to conclude by proposing a new account or theory of the development of the modern family. Indeed, I hope this is a reminder rather than a first indication that this is not to be the case. In chapter three I stressed the rather limited use to which my data could be put. It may serve as something of a test case for other accounts, but cross-sectional data from one period alone cannot generate a new account of social change. Inevitably, my use of oral history has more often raised questions of the accounts than provided answers. Unfortunately, then, 'conclusion' is something of a misnomer, since this chapter largely consists of laying out of questions. I start by summarising, very briefly, the last four chapters and then discuss the issues which this material raises for the abstract accounts of the development of 'the modern family'. I end with some further thoughts suggested by this study that are relevant to future work in the field.

The aim of the last four chapters was to establish the extent of the presence or absence of the 'four features' of 'the modern family'. These features - 'child-centredness', 'separation-off', an emphasis on the individual, and exaggerated sex-role segregation - were chosen as the commonly identified characteristics of 'the modern family'.

In each case, indicators of the feature were suggested and discussion of the extent of its presence and absence in both middle-class and working-class families followed.

In no case was the choice of indicators straightforward. The precise meaning attributed to a feature has consequences for its operationalisation and this is a question always open to debate. Moreover, the data itself was a constraint, with the absence of information on some topics foreclosing some options. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that a conclusion was fairly reached about the presence or absence of each of the features.

In chapter five I concluded that families in the early 20th century were not typically child-centred. The limited time most children spent with their parents and the way that time was given order by parents suggested that 'spending time with' children was not regarded as a priority. Parents did not have a sense of spending time with children as an activity which needed no additional end for its justification. Although there were some exceptions among the working and lower middle class, the behaviour of respondents mothers', middle-class and working-class, suggests that good housekeeping did not typically include talking to and playing with children.

Moreover, relationships between parents and children could often be described as reserved, with children accepting that parents were 'naturally' an authority to be obeyed. Again, this pattern was not class-specific. The typical system of authority did not exclude affection, but

the degree to which the majority of parents set themselves apart from children precluded child-centredness.

In chapter six, I concluded that families in the early 1900s were not clearly 'separated-off' in the way anticipated by the accounts. The family was structurally separated-off, but this did not result in the family being experienced as qualitatively different and special to any great degree. The family was not an emotionally intense oasis in an emotional desert: such a formulation would exaggerate the intensity of affect within and its absence without. I examined the restrictions which parents placed on children, asking to what extent they communicated a sense of home as 'safe' and of the outside world as 'threatening'. A few better-off working-class parents did communicate a wariness of the outside world, but in most cases the restrictions placed on children served purposes other than emphasising the boundary between family and the wider world. In most cases this wariness was absent and the family was not a castle providing protection from a hostile environment.

Both working-class and middle-class parents did contain their children in the family to a degree. Children and young people could not normally 'be out' without their parents having some knowledge of where they were. Many respondents never had a key to their parents' house and parents continued to impose curfews, at least until their children were in their late teens and early twenties. A

few particularly vigilant working-class parents kept their children at home most of the time, except for trusted organised leisure, like church events.

For the majority of parents the extent to which children were contained in the family remained more minimal. Most working-class parents were content with a much vaguer idea of where their children were, and were unabashed by their participation in part-time and casual work which gave children an early insight into the adult world of the town. Many middle-class parents did not need to keep their children at home in order to control the contacts they made with the outside world, since their children were typically part of an exclusively middle-class world of sociability.

Having concluded that families were not 'emotionally intense' and 'separated-off' in the terms of the accounts, in chapter seven I argue that there was, however, an emphasis on the individual. I tried to weigh the elements of personal self-assertive choice against serving family needs and goals, tracing the balance of these elements in the negotiations of major transitions: leaving full-time education, entering work and leaving home. In the case of middle-class respondents personal choice - albeit within predetermined boundaries - was the major element, although some chose to return to home or stay at home to look after their parents. In the case of working-class respondents family need was often asserted in a way which determined the age of school leaving and the initial choice of work,

which in some cases meant leaving home. But the evidence suggests that working-class respondents (and, in many cases, their parents) also recognised limits to their obligations to serve family needs and their right to lives of their own. Thus, it seemed, some asserted themselves in the face of continued demand for support for their family. Some were spontaneously given greater autonomy by parents and some chose to give continued service recognising that this was not the only possible course of action.¹

Finally in chapter eight I argue that the form of sex-role segregation anticipated by the accounts was, indeed, present, although with some modification. The experience of respondents was consistent with the division of men and women into 'breadwinner' and 'housewife'. If socialisation is defined loosely as predisposing experience rather than narrowly as explicit training, then girls were undoubtedly socialised into 'housewives'. Thus by inference, the increased focusing of women on 'non-productive' domestic work to which the accounts refer has indeed taken place. However, in so far as the accounts believe that this new domestic focus took the form of a focus specifically on the child, then this was not, of course, the case.

Some Implications of these Findings for the Selected Authors

There are several aspects of these findings which are damaging to all the accounts. These can be summarised by saying that 'the modern family' as they understand it did

not exist in Scotland in the early 20th century, at least in a fully developed form as the dominant family type. Of the four major agreed characteristics of 'the modern family', two were not features of most of my respondents' families. Firstly, child-centredness and emotionally intense parent/child relationships and secondly, the sense of the family as 'separated-off', were not pervasive as anticipated by the accounts. Moreover, this was true for the middle classes as well as for the working class. Thus accounts cannot be saved by the prediction that 'the modern family' was initially a middle class phenomenon.

These findings are more damaging to some accounts of the development of 'the modern family' than others. I indicated in chapter three that the pattern of presence or absence of particular features of 'the modern family' might be used to discriminate between the accounts.

I argued that different accounts suggest different rankings of the four agreed features - 'separation-off', emotional intensity, individualism and sex role segregation - in terms of the sequence of their emergence. There are thus other differences between approaches which are close enough to empirical prediction to lend themselves to assessment. For example, for Stone an emphasis on the individual should precede emotionally intense relationships since emotional intensity is only possible once individualism has softened patriarchal relations; whereas Aries makes an opposite prediction, since he believes the emphasis on the individual stems from concern and affection

for 'the child'. At the very simple level of presence and absence my findings cast more suspicion on the account of Aries than the account of Stone, for I have found that an emphasis on the individual is present while parent/child relations were not, in general, emotionally intense.

Obviously, however, rather more detailed discussion is desirable. Simple checking of presences and absences could lead to far too summary verdicts. But there is an overall pattern that is worth identifying and evaluating. A number of authors assume a broadly similar sequencing of the emergence of features of 'the modern family'. The less abstract Parsons, Zaretsky and Aries all indicate that the first two features to emerge are the 'separated-off' nature of the family and exaggerated sex-role segregation. These are then followed by emotional intensity and an emphasis on the individual, though not necessarily in that order. Because of the importance of this common thread I shall in what follows discuss these three authors - Parsons, Zaretsky and Aries - first.

Stone and Goode set themselves somewhat apart by the clarity of their emphasis that individualism precedes emotional intensity. Donzelot, too, attributes some causal significance to individualism. I thus discuss them next. Shorter when talking about the middle-class family offers a different sequence, emphasising the primacy of emotional intensity. He and Lasch are the last authors discussed.

Parsons. Zaretsky. Aries

Parsons

Of all the accounts that of Parsons is probably least amenable to assessment. It does not predict sequential ordering as clearly as other accounts. However, the less abstract Parsons is often read as suggesting that 'the modern family' is shaped to fit the modern occupational structure. While this, or any sequential reading of Parsons, clearly involves a certain amount of licence it is, for example, only a slight modification of the version offered by Harris (1969, 98-116).

In this reading of Parsons, then, the emerging modern occupational structure created the opposition of 'family' and 'work', and separated the nuclear family off from wider kin. The opposition of 'family' and 'work' was experienced as such because the occupational structure became increasingly a competitive sphere in which individuals were judged by their talents. These competitive values were, therefore, antithetical to the automatic acceptance, within the family, of family members as family members. The opposition of values between 'family' and 'work' resulted in the experience of them as separate worlds. Sex-role segregation was an adaptation^{at} to the tension between 'family' and 'work', as well as an adaptation to their physical separation. It reduced this tension by creating a division of labour capable of both maintaining the psychological stability of one adult worker and socialising others.

Simultaneously, the need of the occupational structure

for a geographically and socially mobile labour force distanced the nuclear family from wider kin. As this happened, so the 'emotional space' for emotionally intense relationships within the family increased. This increased emotional intensity was in turn a necessary ingredient in the successful socialisation and stabilisation of adult personalities achieved in the sex-segregated role structures of 'the modern family'. The simultaneity of the separation-off and sex segregation was thus not accidental. A further necessary ingredient was an emphasis on 'the abstract individual'. Parents had to foster autonomy in their children if they were to survive the occupational structure. The final, cumulative, aggregate product of these adjustments is 'the modern family'.

The absence of 'the modern family' in the early 1900's could be explained in terms of Parsons' account if the modern occupational system was also absent. Parsons' view of characteristic needs of the modern occupational system has indeed come under scrutiny. Historians now note that mobility, at least geographic mobility, is not specific to a 'modern' occupational system. Population turn over in Britain was high prior to 'industrialisation' (Anderson, 1983). Harris (1969, 112) questions whether industrialisation did initially create a working-class labour force which was geographically and socially mobile and a labour market in which each individual was increasingly assessed according to her or his achievements. Harris thought then²

that it might simply be a question of timing.

In other words, the impact of my findings on Parsons' account would be lessened if it were the case that early twentieth century Scotland, though industrialised, did not yet possess the 'modern' occupational system that some late stage of industrialisation might bring. To test this by creating indices of modernity in an occupational system (degree of occupational differentiation, geographical mobility, social mobility, etc.), and testing census and other data for these, might be possible, but it is beyond the scope of this work.

In any case, even were such a procedure to show that a modern occupational system emerged in Scotland only after this period, Parsons' account could not emerge unscathed. Whatever the nature of the occupational sphere, certain aspects of 'the modern family' are explicitly present and others absent, in a pattern which is hard to interpret consistently in Parsonian terms.

In the early 20th century, the family was relatively isolated from other kin.³ Despite this structural separation from kin, however, emotional intensity did not follow. The absence of emotional intensity (and also the lack of experience of the family as 'separated-off' in general) might be accounted for by the absence of the competitive values of the occupational sphere and, therefore, by the absence of a sense of opposition and tension between family and work. But this would then leave unexplained the extent of sex-role segregation and the

emphasis on the individual in the families of the early 1900's. Where have these come from, if the modern occupational system to which they are posited to be an adaptation, does not exist.

Zaretsky

Zaretsky's views on the sequence of the emergence of the features of the modern family can be inferred from the following passages: 'By the nineteenth century the bourgeoisie had formulated a very different ideal of the family - that of an enclave protected from industrial society. Although this ideal was based upon the bourgeois family it also pervaded petty bourgeois and proletarian family life' (1976, 49)'...Reflecting this separation [of 'family' and 'society'], the belief in separate 'spheres' for men and women came to dominate the ideology of the family in the epoch of industrial capitalism' (ibid, 51), and this in turn resulted in the separation-off of childhood and adulthood. The separated-off, age and gender-differentiated family becomes the sphere of personal life, that is of emotional relationships satisfying the need of individuals to be 'valued for themselves' (ibid, 61), 'the primary institution in which the search for personal happiness, love and fulfilment takes place' (ibid, 65).

The whole package of change, for Zaretsky, rests on the separation-off of the family. It occurs first among the middle class and then among the working class. His most

cautious statement about the timing of these changes is as follows: 'The proletariat itself came to share the bourgeois ideal of the family as 'utopian retreat'. Although this development did not emerge clearly until the twentieth century, its preconditions were established in the early stages of industrial capitalism' (ibid, 61).

The absence of both a developed sense of 'separated-offness' and the subsequent monopoly of the family over a new intense personal life cast considerable doubt on his thesis. Moreover my data indicate that sex-role segregation, in contrast to the 'separated-off' aspect of the family, was relatively well developed. This again, poses a particular problem since Zaretsky conceives of sex-role segregation and 'separated-offness' as simultaneous correlates of the structural separation of 'family' and 'work'.

In Zaretsky's view it was capital which split 'family' and 'work' and thus both exacerbated the division of labour between the sexes and created the family as a private bounded entity. For Parsons it was industrialisation or occupational differentiation that was at the root of these changes. Like Parsons, Zaretsky can here be criticised at a detailed as well as overarching level. Thus the feminist critique of his emphasis on 'capital' and neglect of patriarchy is given added weight by the absence of the anticipated 'separated-off' family.

Aries

The view that the separated-off family precedes

emotionally intense relationships is shared by Aries. In his account, however, it is concern for children and the desire to separate childhood and adulthood which initiates the process. The family is separated-off to protect the child. This same concern for children cannot develop into emotionally intense relationships until the separation of childhood and adulthood, and of the family and wider social world, have been achieved. The family must keep society 'at a distance' (Aries, 1973, 385). In Aries' view it is the spread of this separated-off modern family that is responsible for the modern emphasis on the individual.

The absence of the separated-off family in early twentieth century Scotland is, again, highly problematic for an account that gives priority to this feature. There are also more detailed comments that can be made on the consequences of my data for this position. In chapter three I suggested that some handle on the empirical validity of Aries' work could be gained if we ascertain the extent to which a separate sphere of childhood precedes more derivative features such as emotional intensity and individualism. My data indicates that neither working-class nor middle-class families were characterised by emotionally intense parent/child relationships. The 'centring of the family on the child' was not typical. But, indeed, it is not clear whether the separation of childhood and adulthood and the idea of 'the child' were fully established in early twentieth century Scotland. At best, this indicates that

the history of 'childhood' in Scotland may be radically different from France, and Aries' account would thus be revealed as indeed limited in its scope. But it would at least also mean that the damage to the sequential account implicit in Aries is less certain.

On the matter of the class distribution of 'childhood', it was noted in chapter two that Aries anticipates a considerable lag between the adoption of 'childhood' by middle class and working class. Interviews with people who were children in the early 1900s suggest that in the majority of working-class families the idea of 'the child' in Aries sense was not developed. It is more difficult to be conclusive with respect to middle-class families. In contrast to working-class children, middle-class children were typically in school longer, they were less likely to be responsible for domestic work while in school, and unlikely to be contributing to the family income. In these important senses they were more separated-off from the adult world.

But even here it is not certain that middle-class parents had what Aries takes to be a modern sense of 'the child'. The degree of separation-off of middle-class children could reflect several conflicting views of the child and not necessarily a view of children as innocent and fragile and in need of protection while their delicate nature unfolded. There have been very different traditions of understanding childhood. Modern versions of the Calvinist doctrine of original sin (Stone, 1969, 254-256)

were not necessarily obliterated by 'a tide of sentiment for the child' (Somerville, 1982, 125). The behaviour of some middle-class parents in the early 1900s was quite compatible with a view of children as imperfect adults, not yet fit for adult company and requiring disciplinary training and containment. If children were seen primarily as nuisances, this might provide a powerful motive for delegating as much child care as possible to paid 'help'.

The precise view of 'the child' held by middle-class parents is important because it is clear that the degree of separation of children from the adult world in the early 1900s did not automatically lead to a 'separated-off', emotionally intense family. This suggests either that the connections between the structural separation of childhood and adulthood, the idea of 'the child' and the emergence of 'the modern family' are more remote than Aries assumes, or that it is only when the structural separation-off of children is motivated by a particular view of 'the child' that emotionally intense relationships follow.

This indicates a general point that applies to Parsons and Zaretsky as much as Aries, and indeed to some extent sums up my criticisms of all three. A structural separation, whether it be of family and kin, 'family' and 'work', or of children and adults, cannot be treated as if automatically associated with a profound and elaborate reorientation of attitudes. Nor is it adequate to take - as does Aries - the views of educators and moralists as

indicative of those of parents. Such evidence as emerges from my data suggests that it would be rash indeed to assume that change at the level of structure (or 'formal' ideology) is in any straightforward way reflected in the lived reality of majority family life.

Donzelot

Donzelot suggests a slightly different order for the emergence of the features of 'the modern family'. He too stresses the primacy of 'separated-offness' and sex-role segregation, while emotional intensity is treated as an effect. The emphasis on the individual in 'the modern family' is less clearly so. For Donzelot, the separated-off sex-segregated family was fostered by the State and State sanctioned bodies; these State agents use the ideology of individualism to intervene in the family. Thus external pressure was exerted to create 'separated-off' families while simultaneously these families were policed in the name of the individual, particularly the individual child.

In chapter six I discussed the impact of State agents on the lives of my respondents and found it fell considerably short of expectations aroused by Donzelot: frequent interventions by the state as 'super-parent' were not perceived as features of their lives, despite documentary evidence suggesting state 'policing' was at a peak. Therefore, either doubt is cast on the image of families as effectively 'policed', or it is necessary to conclude that the 'policing' was so effective that it was, indeed, invisible.

Of the three analogies to which I likened authors' views of the 'separated-off' family the image of the container, derived from Donzelot, found most support. Working-class and middle-class children and young people were, to a limited degree, contained in their families. Working-class and middle-class parents alike wanted their children to be home by a certain time at night, certainly throughout, and often beyond, their teenage years. Both sets of parents, on occasion, expressed a desire to know where their children were and what they were doing. This desire to know, however, was not always, or even often, associated with keeping children at home. Only a few vigilant parents discouraged their children from going out and taking part in what, to their peers, were normal patterns of sociability.

Middle-class parents with middle-class resources lived in 'nice' areas with 'suitable' neighbours, tennis clubs and associations. The combination of both the availability of paid 'help' to escort children and young people and the web of distinctively middle-class sites and patterns of sociability may have made such vigilance unnecessary. If, as I have suggested, parents were more concerned with maintaining class boundaries than family boundaries, then there was no reason for middle-class parents to keep their children at home.

Interestingly, attempts to keep children at home were more common among families on the boundary between working

class and middle class. Those on the margins of the middle class may have felt a considerable need to protect their children from 'unsuitable' influence of working-class styles of life. But again this suggests that it was class not the outside world as such that was the issue.

The attitude of the majority of working-class parents is less certain. But again their 'containing' behaviour does not necessarily stem straight-forwardly from a desire to protect the child. The most obvious 'containing behaviour' was parents' insistence that children and young people be 'in' at a certain time. In chapter six I suggest that working-class parents, when demanding that children and young people were 'in', were not solely, nor even primarily, motivated by concern for children's susceptibility to corruption on the streets. Parents, in both middle-class and working-class households typically retained the role of gate-keepers, some until their offspring were in their late teens or early 20s and some indefinitely. In many working-class households, where 'having friends in' was not the typical pattern (a class difference which persists (Allan, 1979)), exercising this role was largely reduced to laying down and enforcing curfews. Thus working-class parents had a more restricted repertoire of ways of saying 'this is my house'. The 'curfew' was an important element in the 'differential dialectic' between parents and children: it was a routine assertion that parents were the bosses of the house.

Fathers were at least equally involved in insisting

that children and young people be in at a certain time as mothers. And this goes against Donzelot's account, where it was working-class mothers who, accepting a role akin to state registered nurse and family social worker, enticed husbands and children off the streets, away from temptation, into the sanctity of the house.

I do not wish to deny that parents ever acted to protect their children from external dangers. Clearly the 'waiting up' and 'watching out', that many parents did when their offspring, particularly their daughters, were out at a dance, is not just an element in a 'deferential dialectic'. But part of an explanation of this behaviour must be a more sophisticated version of 'gender' than that offered by Donzelot's account.

I have noted that there is some match between my data and Donzelot's picture of parents as actively containing their children (and thus, perhaps unwittingly, assisting the State). However, without clearer evidence of the State actually taking an intervening role, and without more obvious interrelations between the behaviour of parents and State purpose, we may be doing nothing more than observing that parents performed some socialising functions.

Stone and Goode

I have indicated that Stone's account suggests the following sequence of features: separated-off, sex-role segregated, an emphasis on the individual, emotionally intense. Stone talks of a move from the 'restricted

patriarchal nuclear family' to 'the closed domesticated nuclear family'. The former family form is characterised by separation-off from wider social world and sex-role segregation. The latter is 'the modern family' and therefore exhibits all its features. The term restricted indicates a degree of separation-off from the wider social world. Like other authors, Stone clearly indicates he is referring to an experiential separation: 'the importance of the nuclear core increased, not as a unit of habitation but as a state of mind' (1979, 93). The term closed refers to a 'continuation of the emphasis on the boundary surrounding the nuclear unit This of necessity led to greater stress on internal bonding within the family' (ibid, 411). The transition was largely fostered by the impact of 'affective individualism'. This system of ideas and sentiments sanctioned the pursuit of individual happiness through domestic affection (ibid, 180). Patriarchal authority was simultaneously undermined by the new emphasis on the individual. The stress on the reciprocal duty of individuals to mutually respect each other (ibid, 165), in Stone's view, fostered more equal relationships which were more conducive to emotional intensity.

He also suggests that these changes occurred first among the urban middle class. His most cautious statement about timing is: 'Many [changes] never penetrated the poor at all until the nineteenth or even the twentieth centuries. The outcome was not so much the replacement of one family type by another as the widening of the

varieties' (ibid, 414). This statement is something of a disclaimer for the impression created by the rest of the book that one particular family type 'the closed domesticated nuclear family' was becoming the dominant family form.

Like Burnett (1982, 53), I have occasion to question the class differences suggested in Stone's account. Unlike Burnett I am not able to conclude that affective individualism and, by implication, 'the modern family' were most evident among 'the middle and artisan classes' (ibid, 54). There was more emphasis on the individual as such, at least in an earlier stage in the life-course, in some middle-class families. But this was not necessarily accompanied by intimacy between parents and children. Although emotion was not absent, many middle-class parent/child relationships could not be described as emotionally intense. In working-class families there were fewer opportunities for children to assert themselves as individuals until they were in their late teens or early twenties, but here too it was generally recognised that children ultimately deserved autonomy as proprietors of their own person. Again few relationships could be described as emotionally intense.

The relationship between an emphasis on the individual and degree of affect is not a simple one. Stone suggests that individualism and affect appear together under the influence of affective individualism. But my data suggests

that matters were more complex; for example, those working-class children who did express particularly strong bonds with their parents, usually mother, behaved in the least individualistic manner, foregoing preferred employment and marriage to look after mother.

The exercise of parental authority is a possible intervening variable between an emphasis on the individual and affect. In chapter five I discussed the view that extreme deference and strong affect are antithetical. I pointed out that more equal parent/child relationships were not necessarily more intense emotionally. But, although it was the case that some very deferential relationships were affectionate, there was some evidence to suggest that children who were less distanced from their parents by demands for deference were, indeed, emotionally closer.

This does not mean, however, that a lesser exercise of parental authority always followed from an emphasis on the individual and gave rise to emotional intensity. Many families successfully combined an emphasis on the individual and a clear and rigid hierarchy between parents and children. In some middle-class families this was achieved by allowing children a say in their education and choice of employment while making it clear in many other daily ways ('eat everything put in front of you', 'only speak if spoken to') that adults, particularly parents, were their superiors.

In working-class families similar techniques were used and parents often also demanded service of their children.

Yet they knew that such service could not be demanded indefinitely. Thus parental authority was qualified to a degree by an emphasis on the individual but it was not threatened. Respondents' accounts do not suggest parental authority under systematic attack. Moreover, the consequences of the qualification was certainly not anything approaching an equal relationship between parents and children.

Goode argues that structural change and individualistic philosophy affect 'the family' simultaneously. Working-class families, however, were transformed in the first instance by the former and middle-class families by the latter. The working-class family then, he predicts, passes through an intermediate phase akin to that described by Stone as 'the restricted patriarchal nuclear family'. At this stage the family is structurally and to some extent experientially separated-off, and, because of the structural separation of men and women, more sex-role segregated than before. As with Stone, the intervention of further external factors, particularly individualistic philosophy, is needed to complete the transformation.

Thea Thompson (1981) suggests that this intermediate family form still predominated in the Edwardian period. Since she is talking of all classes (except the poorest) this conclusion contains an implicit critique of both Stone and Goode, since this family form ought on their accounts to be in decline, especially amongst the middle class.

Thus Stone describes the history of the family as waves of patriarchy and repression followed by counter-revolutionary waves of permissiveness. The end of the nineteenth century was characterised by the latter: 'a second and far more intensive phase of permissiveness, beginning slowly among the middle classes in the 1870s, and spreading to the social elite in the 1890s...' (1979, 423). This new permissiveness, in his view, ought to have carried further forward the diffusion of the 'closed domesticated nuclear family'. For Goode too, by the early 1900s the middle class families should have been egalitarian and emotionally close, or at least more so than working-class families.

Like Thompson, I have found little to suggest that egalitarianism and emotional closeness were pervasive. Nor have I found them to be present in the middle class and absent in the working class. But I would be cautious in supporting her suggestion that what we have is a survival (not unpredicted by Stone - see *ibid*, 23) of the 'restricted patriarchal nuclear family. Such a characterisation of families in the early 1900s as 'restricted patriarchal nuclear' families fits tolerably well in many cases, but some modification is needed. Stone suggests that the internalized values and expectations of members of this family type included: '... expectations of authority and respect by the husband and father, and of submission, obedience and deference by the wife and the children'. As noted earlier in this section, the authority of parents in the early 20th century was qualified to a

degree by an emphasis on the individual. Moreover, the deferential distance between children and their mother was not systematically less than the deferential distance between children and their father, at least to the extent and for the reasons suggested by the notion of 'the restricted patriarchal nuclear family'.

Some parents - sometimes fathers, sometimes mothers - spent an exceptional amount of time with their children. Distance between parents and children in these cases was reduced. A few parents, more often fathers, were so absent that they had, in effect, no relationship with their children. But the general pattern was a deferential relationship with both mother and father. It was not the case that mothers spent so much more time, or such a different quality of time, with their children as to create a mother-child bond that lacked much of the distance of the father-child relation. It is true that working-class children often had more affection and sympathy for their mother than their father, as illustrated by the frequent references to a desire to help mother. But I would suggest that this was not because the father systematically demanded greater deference, but because mother's work, with its obvious toil and stress, was more visible to children.

So some revision of Stone's (and Goode's) position is necessary, and, unlike Thompson, I would suggest that we need a concept different from 'restricted patriarchal nuclear family' to describe the dominant early twentieth

century form. We need a term that denotes distance and deference between parents and children but that, unlike 'patriarchal', does not lay the emphasis on the role of the father.

Shorter

Shorter more than any other author attributes causal significance to feelings. The emotional attachment of mothers to their children, particularly concern for infant welfare, is at the centre of the shift to the modern family in his account: all else follows. It is true that he also identifies 'individualism' as an independent causal variable but the sequence of events he suggests, in effect, attributes a secondary role to individualism.

This is despite the fact that the first 'surge in sentiment' which Shorter refers to was, in his terms, caused by individualism. This first surge, 'the romance revolution' was the result of transferring a self-seeking individualistic orientation, learned in the market-place, to inter-personal relationships (Shorter, 1977, 253). But this surge predominantly affected the working class, since it required changes in the attitudes of women (the extent to which men's attitudes were important is left unclear). Middle-class women were not similarly exposed to 'the logic of the market-place', and did not undergo a similar transformation.

This particular surge in emotion, however, is not subsequently clearly integrated into Shorter's account of the development of 'the modern family'. There are, rather,

two separate strands in his work, an account of this development and an account of changes in sexual behaviour. The two are presented as one but, in fact, meet rarely and hesitantly.

Shorter describes the development of 'the modern family' as occurring first among the middle class and as based on the linked surges of maternal affection and domesticity. Indeed, he uses his assertion that the 'separated-off', emotionally intense family appeared first among the middle class as evidence that the mother/infant relationship, rather than romantic love between spouses, was '...the nucleus about which the modern family was to crystallize' (ibid, 204). Like Aries, he saw the withering of traditional patterns of sociability as something of a necessary precondition of the 'separated-off family' but he also talks of people 'turning their back on' community life. He treats surges of maternal love and domesticity as trigger factors which cause withdrawal from community life. These were experienced initially in middle-class families. 'Worker domesticity' came much later (ibid, 229). Thus romantic love remains largely irrelevant to his account of the development of 'the modern family'.

It is only by failing to mention class differences that Shorter can present the three surges of sentiment as if they were interlocking aspects of a single process of transition. This he inexplicably does on occasion: 'Romantic love detached the couple from communal sexual

supervision and turned them towards affection. Maternal love created a sentimental nest within which the modern family would ensconce itself, and it removed many women from involvement with community life. Domesticity, beyond that, sealed off the family as a whole from its traditional interaction with the surrounding world.' (Ibid, 225) This contradicts the insignificant part romantic love plays in his own account of the development of 'the modern family'.

Shorter's account of changes in sexual behaviour and the surge of romantic love are the most criticised part of his work. I have no wish to add to existing criticism (alluded to in previous chapters) of the idealism of his account and the problems of evidence associated with it. I will here restrict myself to one observation of direct relevance to Shorter's account of the development of 'the modern family'.

That is that there is far from unequivocal evidence in my data of the presence of his 'prime mover' - the overwhelming emotional attachment of mothers to children. There is no doubt that many middle-class and most working-class mothers devoted considerable time to the care of their infants. But this did not imply the family's awareness of itself as a 'precious emotional unit' (ibid, 225) in either class. Married women were arguably more focused on 'non-productive' domestic activities than in previous family forms, but this did not mean a focus, especially an emotional focus, on children. It could be argued that in some cases the burden of this 'non-

productive domestic work disallowed time with children other than as an aspect of housework. But middle-class mothers who were relieved of some of the burden of housework did not automatically spend more time with their children, and it would be a rash inference to assert that working-class mothers would have done so.

Lasch

Lasch suggests that by the 20th century the era of the family as a 'haven in a heartless world' was already waning under the influence of various external agents. The process of the 'proletarianisation of parenthood' was already underway in his view. Like Donzelot, he attributes considerable significance to State intervention.

Clearly, not all of the types of intervention in the family to which Lasch refers were assembled by the early 1900's. The mass media and the 'propaganda of commodities' (1977,19) were not developed to the same degree, nor were the helping professions. As noted in chapter four, however, several mechanisms for State intervention within the family were well established by the early 1900's. But, as shown in chapter six, my respondents were not in general aware of the exercise of these mechanisms. As with the case of Donzelot, it would thus be mistaken to leap from their existence (which can be established from ordinary documentary evidence) to the assumption of their widespread use and influence.

There is admittedly one area where State intervention

was well established, but it took altogether a less dramatic form than Lasch implies: that is school. My respondents did, in the majority, attend school regularly. My data does not allow a direct answer to the question of the extent of influence of this on their families; some authors claim the effect was profound. Banks (1981) for example, suggests that school experience radically transformed pupils attitudes with marked consequences for their subsequent family building. However, his case remains unsubstantiated.

But this qualification hardly saves Lasch's account. Most obviously, parental authority remained firm and was afforded legitimacy, whereas in his account parental authority is sapped as parents lose their functions to other agents and lose confidence in their own ability to be parents.

This is not to say that 'experts' and State agents had no influence on families in the early 1900's. As noted in chapter six, working class parents did often back up the authority of teachers and of the police, by punishing children who had been punished. I suggest in that chapter, that this was a way for parents to reassert themselves as ultimate authority by having the last word (or smack!). Whatever the motivation of these smacks, it is clear that parental authority in the working-class family in the 1900's was not generally under any threat from external agents.

The influence of 'experts' was a little greater in

middle class families. The opinions of doctors and teachers were cited on occasion⁴. But again, parental authority was not usurped.

One of the ways parental authority can be undermined by the mass media, Lasch believes, is through the production of role-models against which children can match their parent's behaviour. Because of the heterogeneity of the middle class, children were often aware that the restrictions placed on them by their parents were not universal. However, parental authority remained sufficiently sacrosanct to be rarely challenged on these grounds. For example, the fact that the majority of girls at Fiona's school played hockey did not lead her to presume her father and his doctor friend were wrong, nor to challenge the fact that she was not allowed to play hockey. Awareness of differences between parents was less commonly expressed by working-class respondents.⁵

Conversely, it would be difficult to make out the early twentieth century Scottish family as a pre-intervention Laschian 'haven in a heartless world'. As shown in chapter six, neither the family nor the world were experienced in these terms, at least by children and young people. As I argued there, even middle class children and young people were not profoundly 'separated-off' in the family, despite having a 'childhood' and 'youth'. This was not because the family was invaded by the outside world, but because children themselves participated in a world of middle-class

sociability, with the approval of parents. Working-class children were even less 'separated-off'. The family did not shield them, at least for long, from the responsibilities of the adult world. They entered that world full-time at the age of fourteen. And we have little evidence that they were reluctant to do so, or that this was a development their parents regretted.

Further thoughts

Can any pattern be discerned in the plethora of particular criticisms of individual authors that I have made? Perhaps not, but there are one or two threads that may be worth considering. Before pursuing these, I wish to make some brief comments on the lessons I learned while doing the work.

Theory and Methods

As explained in my introduction, the methodological difficulties of this work are such that I am not about to present it as an exemplar! Nevertheless, there are, I think, some suggestions that can be made on the basis of the experience of doing this work that have implications for methods of studying family forms and for theories about them. Indeed, some of these suggestions arise directly from the difficulties I faced.

Most salient is the question of indicators. Concepts such as emotional intensity, child-centredness and individualism are the common currency of thinking about the family. Yet these are extremely ill-defined concepts and almost universally lack clear, agreed indicators. The

practice of research, both historical and contemporary, would be greatly facilitated, and its results would be of far greater generalisability, if a discourse existed that clarified the concept/indicator problems surrounding the study of family forms.

Of course, this cannot be a methodological exercise alone, in any narrow sense. Part of the difficulty of constructing an indicator of 'emotional intensity' is the absence of a relevant theory of emotions. Central here is the fact that the indicators in question bear upon precisely such a difficult area, one in which it is necessary to bear in mind both the psychological complexity of human beings and the historical variability of human psychological structures.

Part of the difficulty seems to be the theoretical isolation, within sociology and history, of much writing on 'the family'. Thus concepts of power and authority remain strangely restricted to the terms of an exchange theory: for example, Bell and Newby's (1976) analysis of 'the deferential dialectic' stands virtually alone as an attempt to apply Weberian notions to an analysis of marriage as a power relationship.⁶ There is an equivalent or greater neglect of alternative ways of conceptualising parental authority.

Part of the difficulty seems to be the disciplinary boundaries themselves. Psychology is split from social history. True, some writers (Lasch for example) appeal to

Freud. But unreconstructed Freudianism would hardly been seen by most contemporary psychologists as an adequate account of the human psyche and of human emotional development. An explicit 'psychohistory' does of course exist, but it remains a separate (perhaps even a 'cranky') subfield of history.

I have not in this thesis tackled head-on these difficult points of theory, which exist not merely in the overlap between family history and psychology but also, for example, in the overlap between family history and economics. But these points will have to be tackled, hopefully in fruitful conjunction with empirical work.

Issues which are persistently problematic to the accounts

There are two issues that have persistently been found to be problematic to the accounts of the development of 'the modern family'. One is the authors' typical assumption that sex-role segregation is in some sense a secondary or derivative feature of 'the modern family'. In my data I found a typically 'modern' pattern of sex roles. Whatever the actuality, there was an assumption that man was the 'breadwinner' and woman the 'housewife'. Children were for example typically socialised into this pattern.

So a 'modern' pattern of sex role segregation was found in a situation where many other features of the 'modern family' were absent. Aside from creating problems for particular authors' accounts, this obviously creates problems for the general assumption of the derivativeness

of sex-role segregation. Perhaps this feature is deeper and less epiphenomenal than assumed. Perhaps its status is more cause than effect.

A second pervasive problem concerns childhood. Although only Aries amongst the authors selects out the special status of the 'child' as ~~the~~ central analytical focus, in all of them there is an assumption that an aspect of more exaggerated sex-role segregation is that women will be increasingly more devoted to 'children'. The idea of 'devotion to children' implies a special status of 'the child'. So while none of the other authors is as explicit as Aries, similar assumptions about 'the child' run through their work.

From the kind of evidence I collected, it is clearly difficult to say with confidence what parents' views of their offspring were. But there is little evidence that such a view of 'the child' as a distinct, delicate type of being requiring special protection was present. And I have argued strongly that most families were not child-centred. So I am forced to conclude that any account that suggests that a 'modern' view of the child should be present in the early 20th century may require correction.

Was there ever a modern family?

But an observation such as this begs the central question. In a general sense (though with particular difficulties in the case of particular authors), accounts of the emergence of 'the modern family' can be saved from

the kind of counter-evidence I have produced by shifting forward in time the date of its putative emergence. If the modern family was not there in 1900-1920, maybe it could be found by 1940, or 1950, or 1960?

There are indeed plausible arguments that could be made to support such a point of view. There are undoubtedly developmental processes of relevance that were not completed in the Scotland of around the First World War. The decline of domestic service is one example. Another is the growth of 'affluence'. A third is the secular decline in working hours. Demographic patterns, too, were still shifting. The decline in family size continued well after the period I studied, and life expectancies continued to rise for some time.

If these things matter to the emergence of 'the modern family', then there is good reason to anticipate its later arrival. But it is worth noting that this kind of shift in understanding is more than a mere chronological re-adjustment to cope with minor factual difficulties. It suggests that, irrespective of deep structural changes, the immediate causes of the 'modern family' were more proximate and more localised.

Indeed, it would begin to throw some doubt on the credentials of the adjective 'modern'. That word clearly carries with it considerable baggage - the residual image of a persistent evolutionism, of a history moving to a logical, developmental conclusion. But perhaps what we have taken as 'the modern family' is nothing of that sort.

Perhaps it is a temporary, local variant of family form, created by a transient conjuncture of demographic, economic and occupational conditions to be found for a few decades in North American and European societies. Perhaps - this would be irony indeed - by the time family historians have finally specified its exact location and causes, 'the modern family' will have ceased to exist. Certainly, if full (male) employment and affluence were amongst these causes, they appear alarmingly transient.

So it may be that 'the modern family' codes quite an incorrect notion. It takes a particular family form - characterised as I have suggested by emotional intensity, 'separated-offness', an emphasis on the individual and exaggerated sex-role segregation - and awards that an extreme theoretical priority by calling it 'modern'. This may be a peculiarly misleading starting-point for family history. For perhaps the history of the family has no such teleological structure. Perhaps it is a history of shifting family forms, altering for relatively proximate reasons, and not successively approximating to any endpoint.

Some of the difficulties involved are indicated if one considers just how problematic it is to assert with confidence that any particular family form is dominant at the present day⁷. Sociology of the contemporary family has hardly provided us with an unequivocal answer. That may not simply be a matter of the relative neglect of that

specialism and the lack of resources devoted to it, though those are real factors that need correction. For such research as has been done has indicated a considerable variety of actual family forms. The 'modern family' as pictured by our authors may continue to hold ideological sway, but as a lived experience it is far from pervasive.

1. It should be noted that the indicators I used to test for 'individualism' refer to a later period in the life-cycle, from around 14 to around 25, than do the indicators of the other concepts. It is thus possible that the pattern of presence of 'individualism' together with absence of other features of 'the modern family' might be the result of very rapid changes taking place at this time. But nothing in my data suggests this actually was the case, and, as I argued in chapter four, the early inter-war period was not characterised by rapid unprecedented structural change.

2. He suggests that 'the Parsonian characterisation of industrial society may be regarded therefore as an analysis of an extreme type of society to which actual societies will approximate more and more' (1969, 115) as technology advances and the degree of job differentiation increases. In the 1980's, such a statement could not be written. It is no longer taken for granted that advanced industrial societies will have jobs for the majority, never mind increased job differentiation.

3. See footnote one, chapter six.

4. For example, Elizabeth's mother did not persist in making Elizabeth sit and look at the food she would not eat because of a doctor's comments on a previous occasion (see chapter five). Her fear of the medical consequences also prevented her from letting Elizabeth scream and cry loudly without interruption. But then Elizabeth was the only survivor of three infants, and her mother may have been

particularly anxious.

The influence of doctors could also add to the restrictions placed on children. Fiona was not allowed to play hockey, for example, because a doctor said it was too rough for girls.

The opinions of 'experts' had some consequences for young middle-class people's careers. The opinions of teachers regarding the abilities of children were sometimes consulted. Robert, for example, went into the bank because he was supposed to be good at mathematics. Several middle-class respondents also adjusted the pace of their young careers as a result of medical advice. Richard was thought to need a fallow year between university and entering his father's firm. Violet went to Moray House [teachers' training college] rather than university because of a 'heart murmur' and Fiona had to take it easy because of 'threatened appendix'.

5. Some working-class respondents did get rows from their parents for doing things that other children were doing, for example a couple of respondents went to soup kitchens and were told never to do so again.

6. The relative uniqueness of Bell and Newby's essay (1976) is indicated by Morgan's (1981) reliance on this work in his critique of Berger and Kellner (1964).

7. This is not to say that nothing like 'the modern family' described by these authors exists in the present. The piece of recent empirical research in Britain that most

clearly documents its presence is Backett (1982). Backett's careful study is based on long interviews with middle-class couples, with and without their partners. They are clearly child-centred, their lives having been radically reorganised since the birth of their young children; 'understanding the child' is one of their central concerns. The couples have both an idea of 'the child' as having special needs and an overwhelming sense of responsibility for fulfilling these needs. They clearly seek and have emotionally intense relationships but also worry about smothering the child and impairing her or his individualism. The couples are also clearly sex-role segregated, they only differ from the picture anticipated in that they pretend that they are not. They maintain that being a mother and being a father are essentially similar activities, while the mother is clearly more involved in the children (Backett, 1982, 62). The emphasis on the individual and 'fair treatment' for each family member results in the development of a repertoire of coping mechanisms to conceal or treat as temporary irrelevance the greater drudgery of motherhood.

Nevertheless, Backett's study refers to a highly select class location, and to intact two-parent families at a very specific life-cycle stage. Even if the family mores of this group resonate closely with widely held images of how the family ought to be, it would, nevertheless, be extremely rash to conclude that families in other class locations, or of a different composition, would be similar.

APPENDIX ONE

TABLE ONE

GENERAL FERTILITY RATES, 1851-1931, SCOTLAND
(Three-year averages around census year of live births
per 1,000 women [married or unmarried] age 15-49)

1881	1891	1901	1911	1921	1931
132	120	111	97	79	70

Source: Flinn, 1977, Table 5.3.3, 341.

TABLE TWO

CRUDE DEATH RATES, SCOTTISH TOWNS AND CITIES, 1881-1931
(Annual average deaths for three year period around census
year related to census population, per 1,000 living)

	Towns	Cities	Scotland
1881	20.3	22.3	19.7
1891	19.5	22.0	19.7
1901	17.3	20.0	17.9
1911	15.0	16.6	15.1
1921	13.6	15.7	14.2
1931	13.1	14.1	13.4

Source: ibid, table 5.5.6, 382.

TABLE THREE

INFANT MORTALITY RATES, SCOTLAND, 1890-1934
(Annual means of deaths under age one per 1,000 live
births)

1890-1894	126	1915-1919	106
1895-1899	130	1920-1924	92
1900-1904	122	1925-1929	87
1905-1909	114	1930-1934	82
1910-1914	109		

Source: ibid, table 5.5.9, 386.

TABLE FOUR
PERCENTAGE OF SELECTED FEMALE AGE-GROUPINGS MARRIED,
SCOTLAND, 1881-1931

	1881	1891	1901	1911	1921	1931
20-24	26.5	23.6	23.6	21.8	24.6	22.9
25-29	56.9	52.2	52.5	49.7	52.0	50.5
30-34	71.2	68.8	68.8	66.7	67.8	67.6
50-54	80.7	81.5	81.4	79.4	79.7	78.9

Source: Flinn, 1977, Table 5.2.8, 331.

TABLE FIVE
PERCENTAGE OF SELECTED MALE AGE-GROUPINGS MARRIED,
SCOTLAND, 1881-1931

	1881	1891	1901	1911	1921	1931
20-24	15.2	13.4	12.6	11.6	14.6	11.8
25-29	50.7	46.4	45.0	41.8	46.2	43.6
30-34	71.3	68.2	66.6	64.0	68.3	69.3
50-54	87.5	87.1	86.1	84.9	84.0	84.0

Source: *ibid*, Table 5.2.5, 325.

TABLE SIX
MEDIAN AGE AT FIRST MARRIAGE, SCOTLAND, 1881-1931

	WOMEN	MEN
1881	23.6	25.5
1901	24.1	26.2
1911	24.3	26.4
1921	24.5	26.8
1931	24.4	27.0

Source: *ibid*, Table 5.2.8, 331.

TABLE SEVEN
'FEMALE INDOOR-DOMESTIC SERVANTS', SCOTLAND, 1901-1931

	Numbers	As a percentage of all occupied women
1901	143,699	24.3
1911	131,084	22.1
1921	122,248	19.2
1931	138,679	21.0

Source: Census of Scotland 1901, 1911, 1921, 1931.

TABLE EIGHT

DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPATIONS WITHIN THE MIDDLE CLASS,
SCOTLAND, 1911

PROFESSIONALS	OWNERS MERCHANTS DEALERS	ADMINISTRATORS CLERKS	TOTAL OCCUPIED ALL CLASSES
numbers			
43,540	102,850	78,940	1,473,757
percentage distribution within the middle class			percentage of total occupied
19.3	45.6	35.0	15.3

Source: Census of Scotland 1911

TABLE NINE

OCCUPATIONAL CLASS OF THE OCCUPIED POPULATION IN GREAT
BRITAIN, 1911: NUMBERS IN THOUSANDS

Professinals	744	4.0%
Employers, Administrators, Managers, Proprietors	1861	10.1%
Clerical workers	887	4.8%
Foremen, inspectors supervisors	236	1.3%
Skilled manual workers	5608	30.6%
Semi-skilled manual workers	7244	39.5%
Unskilled manual workers	1767	9.6%
Total	18347	100.0%

Source: Routh, 1965, table 1.1, 6-7.

APPENDIX TWO

TABLE ONE

WOMEN FROM WORKING CLASS FAMILIES

Name Place Occupation ³	Year	Father's occ ¹ Mother's occ ²	CB	BO	Deaths -age	SL.age
Agnes Edinburgh kept house; boiling room worker, Duncan's 'sweetie' works	1894	iron moulder/ miner	6	2	mother 12	14
Ailie Edinburgh apprentice quarto-bookbinder, bookbinder	1898	labourer, gas works office cleaner	13	2	six sibs	14
Amy Leith clerkess	1894	foreman bookbinder	7	2		14
Annie Edinburgh assistant, shoe shop; folder, envelope factory	1905	stone mason laundry worker	6	5	father 6	14
Barbara Edinburgh shop assistant	1891	hospital porter	5	2		14
Belle Edinburgh golf bag factory; machine operator, munitions factory	1900	shoe maker	14	10		14
Bessie Edinburgh apprentice bookbinder; 'bookbinder'+; labourer hoisery factory	1896	soldier;labourer tailoress	7	1		14
Betty Falkirk; Leith kept house	1905	miner; invalided- coal seller.	9	4		13
Chrissie Edinburgh resident laundry maid; rubber mill; book-keeper for restaurant	1905	road mender. sweetie shop+	6	4	one sib	12
Dot (Molly's sister) Nr Edinburgh children's nurse	1904	railway linesman	5	4		14

Name Place Occupation ³	Year	Father's occ ¹ Mother's occ ²	CB	BO	Deaths -age	SL.age
Effie Leith;Falkirk; Edinburgh printing; biscuit factory	1900	labourer, brewery, printing. mother worked occupation unrecorded	2	1	father 15	14
Eileen Edinburgh dye stamper, printing works	1901	storeman	10	1	four sibs mother 16	14
Frances mining town; Edinburgh. trainee seamstress	1900	invalid- shale miner, shop result of compensation. ran tea-shop; cook.	13	9	four sibs ²	14
Hatty Leith machine operator, "roperie"	1902	seaman. worked but occupation unrecorded	13	6	four sibs	14
Ina Edinburgh assistant, bootshop; apprentice, printing, printer	1904	brass finisher* worked in the fields	5	1	father 14	14
Isa Edinburgh apprentice, printing; lithographer; book-keeper, local authority	1897	cab driver worked in paper mill	3	2		14
Jane mining town resident shop assistant; maid in nurses' home	1899	engine driver. midwife & kept 'Jenny a' things' shop	10	8	father 5	14
Janet mining village relief maid, hospital; field worker; brick setter and pit head labourer - 'couping the coal'.	1906	miner	9	1		14
Jean Edinburgh hoisery factory	1895	cabinet maker. took boarders ⁺	3	1	father 14	14
Jenny Leith rubber mill; cork factory; apprentice French polisher; French polisher.	1897	soldier;labourer. flour mill ⁺	11		only survivor ² father 6	14
Jessie mining town packer, pottery; labourer, woodyard labourer; maid	1897	ironmoulder/miner	4	4	mother 4	13

Name Place Occupation ³	Year	Father's occ ¹ Mother's occ ²	CB	BO	Deaths -age	SL.age
Kate Wishaw children's nurse	1908	steel erecting engineer	5	2	two sibs	15
Maggie Leith delivery girl, laundry; "roperie"; bonds; chipper & painter, shipyard during the war.	1899	docker. laundry worker	5	1		13
Martha mining village children's nurse; assistant cook	1904	soldier; labourer; war soldier	6	1	father	14
Mary Fife town; Edinburgh resident shop assistant	1897	mason/brick layer	14		named 7£	14
Meg Edinburgh apprentice, printing; boiling room worker, sweetie factory	1896	dairy worker* dairy worker			(see footnote)*	14
Molly (Dot's sister) nr Edinburgh under-house maid; WAAC, waitress	1898	railway linesman	5	2		14
Nan Edinburgh back-shop worker, fruit shop; drilling machine operator, metre works; munitions; labourer boot room, rubber mill	1897	seaman	7	4	one sib	14
Nancy Mining villages; miner Stirling; Edinburgh woolen mill; making collars and cuffs, rubber mill	1901	miner; war sold.;	19	4	nine sibs	14
Nell Leith trainee dressmaker; bottling and labelling, bonds	1900	fisherman	11	9		14
Netty nr Edinburgh book-keeper, small business; under-nurse; nannie	1898	woodturner	5	3	mother	18 14
Nina Edinburgh tobacco factory; apprentice, printing; children's nurse.	1903	plumber	10	6		13

Name Place Occupation ³	Year	Father's occ. ¹ Mother's occ. ²	CB	BO	Deaths -age	SL.age
Pat Dundee; Edinburgh field worker; domestic servant; biscuit factory	1903	second hand shop. helped in shop biscuit factory	1		father	9 13
Peggy Edinburgh apprentice dressmaker; printing work; tin house, biscuit factory; bias binding factory; child minder	1906	soldier* cleaner		(see footnote)*		14
Rosie Edinburgh daily domestic servant; shoe wholesaler's assistant & chip-shop assistant in the evening; in charge of ladie's department of wholesale shoe business.	1908	baker*	6	3		14
Sheila Glasgow apprentice dressmaker; message girl, bootshop; machinist, shirt factory	1889	miner ran small fruit shop	11	6		14
Tilly Edinburgh folder, envelope factory	1890	brass finisher; mission caretaker.	10	9	two sibs	14
Tina mining & mill towns woollen mill, spinning, piecing; maid	1903	miner	6	6	(see footnote) ²	

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CB: - Children born. The number of children born to the mother. Please note that this cannot be read as household size, even when deaths are deducted.

BO: - Birth order. The placing (eg. 1 = oldest) of the respondent among the surviving children.

Deaths -age: -infant and child deaths of siblings and death of parent if before respondent is age 20. The age of the respondent at parent's death is then given.

SL. age: - school leaving age.

NOTES

1. father's occupation refers to the usual paid employment of father in the period up to the respondent's early 20s. Service in the armed forces during the First World War is also noted.

2. mother's occupation refers to paid employment in the same period. This may be under-reported, as I did not probe systematically.

3. respondent's paid employment from leaving school till early

20s.

*

Ina's mother married twice. The father and siblings shown are of the second marriage. Her own father died when she was a baby.

Meg These are Meg's 'adopted' parents, Mr and Mrs Morris. Mrs Morris was approached at work and asked "Do you ken anybody who would take a servant's baby". Mr and Mrs Morris had three grown up children.

Peggy was an illegitimate child. She was de facto adopted by an elderly couple with whom her mother lodged. This couple had adopted another child seven years older than her. Her own mother married a man with three children and had three further children. Her adopted father had 'come out of the army' in poor health. He died when Peggy was 7. When her own mother married Peggy stayed in her new household during the week and with her 'adopted' parents at the weekend. This arrangement only lasted about a year. When her 'adopted' father died she moved full-time to her 'adopted' mother's. Her 'adopted' mother worked as a cleaner.

Rosie's mother married twice. Her own father died when she was two. She was four when her mother married the baker.

+

Bessie was paid a fraction of a time-served male bookbinder.

Chrissie's mother gave up the shop as it did not pay. She blamed this on the demand for "tick".

Jean after her father died.

Jenny's mother had a variety of jobs at "whatever she could get the most money doing". Working in the flour mill is what Jenny remembers.

£

Frances's mother took the children away to Edinburgh when Frances was ten, because of her husband's violence. But their father seized the youngest child and "mother was forced to go back for two years". It took that length of time to sell the shop and thus qualify for money from the parish.

Jenny "My mother had eight but they were a' dead before, then I was born and there were another two. My brother younger than me he was a blue baby and he died when he was eleven". The youngest died age three as the result of a fall.

Mary was unclear about the fate of her siblings. She said her mother had "about 7 of each" but could only name four sisters and three brothers.

Tina's father took the children away to live in digs with him between 1908 and 1914. "I was only young. I just wanted to be with my sisters, cause when my mum took the drink she could be cruel. And then I couldnae stand my dad getting onto my mum. He used to thrash her and everything. I don't know how he got away with it."

TABLE TWO

Name Place Occupation ³	Year	Father's occ ¹ mother's occ ²	CB	BO	Deaths	-age	SL.age
Andrew Leith apprentice grocer; grocer; labourer	1904	fisherman	7	4			14
Angus Edinburgh apprentice marine engineer; engineer; insurance agent	1902	taylor cook+	3	3	father	15	15
Bert Edinburgh message boy, grocer's; apprentice ?; fish & chip shop assistant; milkman	1903	van driver	7	4			14
Bob Edinburgh, apprentice tin-smith; soldier	1888	tin smith	8	1			14
Charles Aberdeen apprentice joiner; joiner	1906	foreman joiner	4	1	two sibs		14
Dannie Edinburgh message boy; soldier	1897	soldier worker, paper and scap metal	3	3	father	1	13
Davy Leith apprentice baker; stockman, wine warehouse	1905	plumber cleaner+	5	4	father	11	14
Douglas Edinburgh apprentice baker; baker; called-up (in Territorials)	1893	joiner	8	7	mother	3	14
Eck nr Edinburgh mine work - ?; pony driving; ?; howking coal	1901	miner; contractor	8	3	one infant		14
Eddie mining towns apprentice baker; foreman, bakery	1904	grocer, employee	6	4			14
Eric Edinburgh labourer, rubber-mill; steam-room rubber-mill.	1905	brewery driver cleaner	5	5	father	6wks	14

Name Place Occupation ³	Year	father's occ ¹ mother's occ ²	CB	BO	Deaths -age	SL.age
Hamish Edinburgh message boy, ironmonger's; porter, printer's; volunteered; as before	1897	bootmaker	8	6	two sibs	14
George Edinburgh gig and van driver for railways; called-up; driver as before	1900	foreman porter	7	7	father	15 14
Hugh Leith apprentice plumber; plumber	1906	house painter; volunteered	5	3		14
Jimmy mining town boot-boy; apprentice joiner; joiner	1903	mason/builder	7	7	mother	10 14
Jock Leith apprentice skinner; message boy butcher's shop; apprentice, building	1907	skinner. made up bundles of firewood	9	3		14
Joe Edinburgh apprentice cabinet maker; cabinet maker	1906	chauffeur; war soldier	7	3		15
Johnnie Edinburgh message boy; dairy worker; soldier	1903	house painter mother worked, occupation unrecorded+	6	1		13
Mickey mining towns mine work - stone picking; lift operator; 'top turns'; underground shifts, not face work; howking coal; volunteered	1895	miner	6	1		13
Pete Edinburgh message boy, baker; apprentice baker; baker; volunteered; baker	1887	working brewer	3	1		14
Ronnie Glasgow office boy, industrial business; clerk, civil service; called up; advance in civil service grade; student, university	1897	police sergeant	5	3	father	5 14
Sandy Leith machine operator, roperie; bookie's assistant; delivery boy; dock labourer	1901	docker	5	2	two infants mother	14 14

Name Place Occupation ³	Year	father's occ ¹ mother's occ ²	CB	BO	Deaths -age	SL.age
Tam Edinburgh apprentice, draftsman; volunteered; as before; draftsman	1898	draper	3	1	older sib	15
Tom mining villages & towns mining with his father; railway worker - carriage cleaner; porter; shunter; volunteered; shunter	1897	miner	6	5	mother 19	13
Wattie Edinburgh message boy; apprentice, printing; called up; letter pressman.	1898	scavenger	5	2		13
Willie mining town labourer, saw-mill; cauker's mate; butcher's van driver	1905	foreman cork cutter	12	11	'one or two'	14

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CB Children born - number of children born to mother. Please note this cannot be read as household size, even when deaths are deducted.

BO birth order - the placing (example 1 = oldest) of the respondent among surviving siblings.

Deaths -age deaths of siblings or parents occurring before respondent reaches the age of 20. In the case of the death of a parent the respondent's age is given at the time.

SL.age the age at which the respondent left school.

NOTES

1. father's occupation refers to the usual paid employment of father in the period up to the respondent's early 20s.

2. mother's occupation refers to paid employment of the mother during the same period. This may be under-reported, as I did not probe systematically.

3. respondent's paid employment from leaving school till early 20s.

+ Angus's mother worked after his father's death
Davie's mother worked after his father's death
Johnnie's mother worked until he was working

TABLE THREE

Name Born Father's occ. CB BO Deaths, A. Servants¹ FE. age
place of upbringing
own occupation

Professionals

Richard 1903 lawyer 2 1 one sib 1 22
Edinburgh
lawyer

Moir 1889 lawyer 3 1 1 or 2 19
Portobello; Edinburgh
tutor; translation, clerical and secretarial work

Rachel 1899 minister 3 1 mother 17 1 + n.m. 16
Village outside Glasgow
dentists mechanic; catering supervisor

Florence 1902 accountant 4 1 2 + n.m. 22
Paisely
teacher

Irene 1903 accountant 4 2 mother 17 1 22
Edinburgh father 20
trained as teacher

Violet 1899 schoolmaster 4 3 one sib 1* 20
Edinburgh
teacher

Commercial and Business occupations

Emily 1888 stockbroker 4 1 one sib 1 + n.m. 19
Edinburgh governess
nurse, child welfare officer

Fiona 1901 importer; tea 7 7 2 + nanny 18
Edinburgh coffee, spices chauffeur
none

Caroline 1910 owner/manager 4 4 5 + n.m. 21
mill village woollen mill or govern.
secretarial work

Grace 189? chemist, owner/ 8 8 father 18 2 + n.m. 19
Edinburgh manager pharma-
none cuticals

Helen 1896 owner/manager 1 father 18 1 + n.m. 21
Glasgow engineering
teacher

Name place of upbringing own occupation	Born	Father's occ	CB	BO	Deaths, A.	Servants ¹	FE.age
Robert Edinburgh bank clerk; nurseryman	1898	owner/manager nursery	7	2		1	18
Catherine town nr Glasgow secretarial work	1902	commercial- traveller	4	2		1 + c.w.	18
Elizabeth Edinburgh teacher	1897	commercial- traveller	3	1	two sibs	1	22
Alexander Edinburgh costing clerk; civil service career	1905	secretary- rtd.farmer	12	12		none	16
Liz Edinburgh clerk in mother's sub post office	1899	telegraph- superintendant (mother ran sub- post office)	4	4	father 4	none	15
Fraser Edinburgh joined father's business, wrought iron & fireplace work	1904	blacksmith's	4	2		?	16
Dorothy nr Hamilton nursing tutor; nurse	1905	butcher's- own stock	4	1		w.w.	21
Harriet Leith telegrapher	1901	dairy-own stock	9	8		1*	14
Ishbel Edinburgh secretarial work	1894	fishmonger's- two shops	3	1	one sib	1	16
Ruth Edinburgh shop saleswomen	1908	tailor's	7	7		none	14
Bill town in Fife butcher, eventually own business	1900	butcher's	5	1	mother 12	c.w.	14½
Lilly Edinburgh worked in the shop	1898	furniture & hardware shop	7	6	father 10	c.m.	14

List of abbreviations used -

CB - children born - number of children born to mother. Please note this cannot be read as household size, even when deaths are deducted.

BO - birth order - the placing (example 1 = oldest) of the respondent among surviving siblings.

Death, A - deaths of siblings or parents occurring before respondent reaches age 20. In the case of the death of a parent, the respondent's age at the time is given.

EE, age - the age at which the respondent finished full-time education. Please note that this is an imperfect measure of extent of higher education since some respondents took further courses after several years out.

n.m. - nurse maid - resident servant whose main responsibility is care of infant or young child.

c.w. - daily cleaning women

w.w. - women who comes weekly to do the wash

c.m. - child minder - women who comes to the house for this purpose.

¹Unless otherwise stated, the figures shown in this column refer to the number of resident domestic servants normally in the household.

*Violet There was no servant till she was 18/19 years old. She explained that by that time her sisters had left and she was working, and so her mother needed help.

Harriet The resident servant was in fact the dairy maid.

TABLE FOUR

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY YEAR OF BIRTH

1896-1890	1891-1895	1896-1900	1901-1905	1906-1910
6	8	30	32	11

N=87

REFERENCES

- ABRAMS, PHILIP, 1970, "Rites de Passage. The Conflicting Generations in Industrial Society", **Journal of Contemporary History** 5(1), 175-90.
- ALLAN, GRAHAM, 1979, **A Sociology of Friendship and Kinship**, London: George Allen and Unwin.
- ALEXANDER, SALLY, 1976, "Women's work in nineteenth century London: a study of the years 1820-50", in Mitchell, J. and Oakley, A. (eds.) **The Rights and Wrongs of Women**, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 59-111.
- ANDERSON, MICHAEL, 1971, **Family structure in nineteenth century Lancashire**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ANDERSON, MICHAEL, 1976, "Sociological history and the working class family: Smelser revisited" **Social History**, 1(3), 317-334.
- ANDERSON, MICHAEL (ed.), 1980, **Sociology of the family**, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- ANDERSON, MICHAEL, 1980, **Approaches to the History of the Western Family 1500-1914**, London: Macmillan.
- ANDERSON, MICHAEL, 1983, "What is new about the modern family: an historical perspective" in British Society for Population Studies, **The Family**, O.P.C.S. Occasional Papers, No. 31.
- ARIES, PHILLIPE, 1973, **Centuries of Childhood**, Harmondsworth: Penguin (first published 1960).
- ASPINWALL, HEATHER, 1983, "Domestic Electrical Appliances in the 1930s: the Electrification of the Home and the Self-Service Economy", Honours Degree Thesis, Liberal Studies in Science, University of Manchester.
- BACKETT, KATHRYN C., 1982, **Mothers and fathers; a study of the development and negotiation of parental behaviour**, London: Macmillan, 1982.
- BAIN, GEORGE SAYWER, BACON, ROBERT and PIMLOTT, JOHN, 1972, "The Labour Force", in Halsey (ed.), 97-128.
- BANKS, JOSEPH A., 1954, **Prosperity and Parenthood**, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- BANKS, JOSEPH A and BANKS, O., 1964, **Feminism and Family Planning in Victorian England**, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

- BANKS, JOSEPH A., 1981, **Victorian Values: Secularism and the size of families**, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- BARKER, DIANA, 1972, "Young People and their Homes: Spoiling and 'Keeping Close' in a South Wales Town", **Sociological Review** 20 (4), 569-90.
- BARKER, DIANA and ALLEN, SHEILA (eds.), 1976, **Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage**, London: Longman.
- BARRETT, MICHELE and MCINTOSH, MARY, 1980, "The Family Wage: Some Problems for Socialist Feminists", **Capital and Class** 11, 51-72.
- BARRETT, MICHELE and MCINTOSH, MARY, 1982, **The Anti-Social Family**, London: Verso.
- BARRON, R.D. and NORRIS, G.M., 1976, "Sexual divisions and the dual labour market" in Diana L. Barker and Sheila Allen (eds.) **Dependence and Exploitation in Work and Marriage**, London: Longman.
- BELL, COLIN and NEWBY, HOWARD, 1976, "Husbands and wives: the dynamics of the deferential dialectic" in Barker and Allen (eds.), 152-168.
- BERGER, P.L. and KELLNER, H., 1964 "Marriage and the Construction of Reality", **Diogenes**, 1-23. Reprinted in Anderson (1980, 302-324).
- BIRCH, AUSTIN E., 1959, **The Story of the Boys' Brigade**, London: Fredrick Muller.
- BLANCH, MICHAEL, "Imperialism, Nationalism and Organised Youth" in Clarke, Critcher and Johnson, 103-120.
- BOOTH, C., **Life and Labour of the People: London**, London: Macmillan.
- BORNAT, JOANNA, 1977, "Home and Work: A new context for trade union history" **Oral History** 5(2), 101-123.
- BRANCA, PATRICIA, 1975, **Silent Sisterhood: Middle Class Women in the Victorian Home**, London: Croom Helm.
- PHELPS BROWN, E.H. and BROWNE, MARGARET H., 1968, **A Century of Pay**, London: Macmillan.
- BRYANT, MARGARET, 1979, **The Unexpected Revolution: a study in the history of education of women and girls in the nineteenth century**, London: University of London Institute of Education.

- BURGESS, KEITH, 1980, **The Challenge of Labour: Shaping British Society 1850-1930**, London: Croom Helm.
- BURNETT, JOHN, 1977, **Useful Toil: Autobiographies of working people from the 1820s to the 1920s**, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- BURNETT, JOHN, 1982, **Destiny Obscure: Autobiographies of Childhood, Education and Family from the 1820s to the 1920s**, London: Allen Lane.
- BURR-LITCHFIELD, R., 1978, "The Family and the Mill: Cotton Mill Work, Family Work Patterns and Fertility in Mid-Victorian Stockport" in Wohl (ed.), 180-196.
- BURSTYN, JOAN N., 1980, **Victorian Education and the Ideal of Womanhood**, London: Croom Helm.
- CLARKE, JOHN, CRITCHER, CHARLES and JOHNSON, RICHARD, 1979, **Working Class Culture: Studies in history and theory**, London: Hutchinson.
- COCKBURN, CYNTHIA, 1981, "The Material of Male Power", **Feminist Review** 9, 41-58.
- COCKBURN, CYNTHIA, 1983, **Brothers: Male Dominance and Technological Change**, London: Pluto Press.
- COLLIS, HENRY, HURL, FRED and HAZELWOOD, REX, 1961, **B.P.'s Scouts: An official history of the Boy Scouts Association**, London.
- COOPER, DAVID, 1972, **The Death of the Family**, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- CORR, HELEN, 1983, "The Schoolgirls' Curriculum and the Ideology of the Home, 1870-1914" in Glasgow Women's Studies Group, 74-97.
- CROSSICK, GEOFFREY (ed.), 1977, **The Lower Middle Class in Britain, 1870-1914**, London: Croom Helm.
- CROSSICK, GEOFFREY, 1977, "The emergence of the lower middle class in Britain: A discussion" in Crossick (ed.), 11-60.
- DAMER, SEAN, 1980, "State, Class and Housing: Glasgow 1885-1919" in Melling (ed.), 73-112.
- DAVIDOFF, LEONORE, 1973, **The Best Circles: Society Etiquette and the Season**, London: Croom Helm.

- DAVIDOFF, LEONORE, 1974, "Mastered for Life: Servant Wife and Mother in Victorian and Edwardian Britain", **Journal of Social History** VII 7(4), 406-428.
- DAVIDOFF, LEONORE, 1976, "The rationalization of housework" in Barker and Allen (eds.), 121-151.
- DAVIDOFF, LEONORE, 1979, "The Separation of Home and Work. Landladies and Lodgers in Nineteenth and Twentieth Century England" in Sandra Burman (ed.) **Fit Work for Women**, London: Croom Helm, 64-97.
- DAVIN, ANNA, 1978, "Imperialism and Motherhood", **History Workshop** 5, 9-65.
- DAVIN, ANNA, 1982, "Child labour, the working class family and domestic ideology in 19th Century Britain", **Development and Change** 13(4), 633-652.
- DELAMONT, SARA and DUFFIN, LORNA (eds.), 1978, **The Nineteenth Century Woman: her cultural and physical world**, London: Croom Helm.
- DURKHEIM, EMILE, 1964, **The Division of Labour in Society**, New York: The Free Press.
- DONZELOT, JACQUES, 1979, **The Policing of Families: Welfare versus the State** (La Police des Familles, 1977), London: Hutchinson.
- DYHOUSE, CAROL, 1981, "Working Class Mothers and Infant Mortality in England, 1895-1914" in Charles Webster (ed.) **Biology, Medicine and Society 1840-1940**, 73-98, London: Cambridge University Press.
- EAGER, W. McG., 1953, **Making Men: The History of Boys' Clubs and Related Movements in Great Britain**, London: University of London Press.
- FLANDRIN, JEAN-LOUIS, 1979, **Families in Former Times: Kinship, Household and Sexuality**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- FLINN, MICHAEL W., 1970, **British Population Growth 1700-1850**, London: Macmillan Student Edition.
- FLINN, MICHAEL W. et al., 1977, **Scottish population history from the 17th century to the 1930s**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- FOUCAULT, MICHEL, 1980, **The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction** (originally published in France as *La Volente de savior*, 1976), New York: Vintage Books.

- FRANKLIN, JILL, 1975, "Troops of Servants Labour and Planning in the Country House, 1840-1914", *Journal of Victorian Studies* 19(2), 211-39.
- GATHORNE-HARDY, 1972, *The Rise and Fall of the British Nanny*, London: Arrow Books.
- GAULDIE, ENID, 1974, *Cruel Habitations, a history of working class housing in Britain*, London: Allen and Unwin.
- GAULDIE, ENID, 1976, "The Middle Class and Working Class Housing in the Nineteenth Century" in McLaren (ed.), 12-35.
- GERSHUNY, J. S., 1982, "Social Innovation: Changes in the mode of provision of services" *Futures* (December).
- GIBBON, FREDERICK P., 1934, *William A. Smith of the Boys' Brigade*, London: Collins (reprinted 1953).
- GIDDENS, ANTHONY and HELD, DAVID¹⁹⁸², *Classes Power and Conflict*, LONDON: MACMILLAN
- GILBERT, BENTLEY, 1973, *The evolution of national insurance in Great Britain: the Origins of the Welfare State*, London: Michael Joseph Limited 1966.
- GILLIS, JOHN R., 1974, *Youth and History: Tradition and Change in European Age Relations 1770 - Present*, London: Academic Press.
- GILLIS, JOHN R., 1975, "The evolution of juvenile delinquency in England 1890-1913", *Past and Present* 67, 96-126.
- GITTINS, DIANA, 1982, *Fair Sex: Family size and structure 1900-39*, London: Hutchinson.
- GITTINS, DIANA, 1975, "Married life and birth control between the wars" *Oral History*, 3(2), 53-64.
- GLASGOW WOMEN'S STUDIES GROUP, 1983, *Uncharted Lives: Extracts from Scottish Women's Experiences, 1850-1982*, Glasgow: Pressgang.
- GOLDTHORPE, JOHN H., LOCKWOOD, DAVID and BECHHOFFER, FRANK, and PLATT, JENNIFER, 1968, *The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GOLDTHORPE, JOHN H., LOCKWOOD, DAVUD, BECHHOFFER, FRANK and PLATT, JENNIFER, 1968, *The Affluent Worker: Political Attitudes and Behaviour*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GOLDTHORPE, JOHN H., LOCKWOOD, DAVID, BECHHOFFER, FRANK and PLATT, JENNIFER, 1969, *The Affluent Worker in the Class Structure*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- GOODE, WILLIAM, 1964, **The family**, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- GOODE, WILLIAM, 1970, **World Revolution and Family Patterns**, New York: Collier Macmillan. The Free Press.
- GORDON, ELEANOR, 1983, "Women, Trade Unions and Industrial Militancy, 1850-1890", Glasgow Women's Studies Group, 52-73.
- GRAY, ROBERT Q., 1976, **The Labour Aristocracy in Victorian Edinburgh**, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- GRAY, ROBERT Q., 1976, "Thrift and Working Class Mobility in Victorian Edinburgh" in MacLaren (ed.), 128-142.
- GRAY, ROBERT Q., 1977, "Religion, Culture and Social Class in Late 19th and early 20th century Edinburgh" in Crossick (ed.), 134-158.
- GRAY, ROBERT Q., 1981, **The Aristocracy of Labour in Nineteenth century Britain c 1850-1914**, London: Macmillan.
- HALL, CATHERINE, 1982a, "The butcher, the baker, the candlestickmaker: the shop and the family in the Industrial Revolution" in Elizabeth Whitelegg et al.
- HALL, CATHERINE, 1982b, "The home turned upside down? The working class family in cotton textiles 1780-1850" in Elizabeth Whitelegg et al.
- HALSEY, A.H. (ed.), 1972, **Trends in British Society since 1900**, London: Macmillan.
- HAMILTON, SHEILA, 1982, "Interviewing the Middle Class: Women graduates of the Scottish Universities c1910-1935" **Oral History** 10(2), 58-67.
- HANNAH, LESLIE, 1979, **Electricity before Nationalisation: a study of the Development of the Electricity Supply Industry in Britain to 1948**, London and Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- HAREVEN, TAMARA K., 1977, **Family and Kin in Urban Communities, 1700-1930**, New York: New Viewpoints, Franklin Watts.
- HAREVEN, TAMARA K., 1982, **Family Time and Industrial Time**, London: Cambridge University Press.
- HARRIS, CHRISTOPHER C., 1977, "Changing conceptions of the relation between family and societal form in western

- society" in R. Scase (ed.) **Industrial Society: Class Cleavage and Control**, Allen and Unwin.
- HARRIS, CHRISTOPHER C., 1969, **The Family: An Introduction**, London: George Allen and Unwin.
- HARRIS, JOSE, 1972, **Unemployment and Politics: A study in English Social Policy 1886-1914**, London: Clarendon Press.
- HARTMAN, HEIDI, 1979, "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: towards a more progressive Union", **Capital and Class** 8, 1-33.
- HERBERT, S. MERVYN, 1939, **Britain's Health**, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- HOBSBAWM, E.J., 1968, **Labouring Men: Studies in the History of Labour**, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- HOLLEY, JOHN CHRISTOPHER, 1978, "The redivision of labour: two firms in nineteenth century South East Scotland". Ph.D. Thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- HOLLINGWORTH, T.H., 1964, "The Demography of the British Peerage", **Population Studies** 18(2), supplement.
- HOLTZMAN, E., 1982, "The pursuit of married love: women's attitudes towards sexuality and marriage in Great Britain 1918-39" **Journal of Social History** 16 (2) 39-52.
- HUGHES, THOMAS P., 1983, **Networks of Power: Electrification in Western Society, 1880-1930**, Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- HUMPHRIES, JANE, 1981, "Protective Legislation, the Capitalist State and Working Class Men: The Case of the 1842 Mines Regulations Act" **Feminist Review** 7, 1-33.
- HUMPHRIES, STEPHEN, 1981, **Hooligans or Rebels? An Oral History of Working Class Childhood and Youth 1889-1939**, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- JONES, GARETH STEDMAN, 1971, **Outcast London: A Study in the Relationship between Classes in Victorian Society**, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- JORDAN, Z.A. (ed.), 1971, **Karl Marx: Economy, Class and Social Revolution**, London: Nelson.
- KEEGAN, JOHN, 1978, **The Face of Battle: A Study of Agincourt, Waterloo and the Somme**, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

- KEELING, FREDERICK, 1914, **Child Labour in the United Kingdom**, London: P.S. King & Son.
- KENDRICK, Steven, 1983 "Social Change and Nationalism in Modern Scotland" PhD Thesis, University of Edinburgh.
- KENISTON, KENNETH, 1971, "Psychological Development and Historical Change" **Journal of Interdisciplinary History** 2, 329-45.
- KNOX, HENRY MACDONALD, 1953, **Two Hundred and Fifty Years of Scottish Education 1696-1946**, Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd.
- KUHN, THOMAS S., 1970a, **The Structure of Scientific Revolutions**, Chicago: University of Chicago Press (second edition).
- KUHN, THOMAS S., 1970b, "Reflections on my Critics" in Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrove, eds., **Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 231-78.
- KUMAR, KRISHAN, 1978, **Prophecy and Progress: The Sociology of Industrial and Post-Industrial Society**, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- LAING, R.D., 1971, **The Politics of the Family and Other Essays**, London: Tavistock.
- LAKATOS, IMRE, 1970, "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes" in Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrove (eds.) **Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 91-196.
- LAND, HILARY, 1980, "The Family Wage" **Feminist Review** 6, 55-77.
- LASCH, CHRISTOPHER, 1977, **Haven in a heartless world: the family besieged**, New York: Basic Books Inc.
- LASCH, CHRISTOPHER, 1980, **The Culture of Narcissism: American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations**, London: Abacus.
- LASLETT, PETER, 1977, **Family life and illicit love in earlier generations: Essays in historical sociology**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LASLETT, PETER and WALL, RICHARD, 1972, **Household and family in past time: Comparative studies in the size and structure of the domestic group over the last three centuries in England, France, Serbia, Japan and colonial North America, with further materials from Western Europe**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LEONARD, DIANA, 1980, **Sex and Generation: A Study of Courtship and Weddings**, London: Tavistock.

- LEVINE, DAVID, 1977, **Family Formation in an Age of Nascent Capitalism**, New York: Academic Press.
- LEVITT, I. and SMOUT, T.C., 1979, **The State of the Scottish Working Class in 1843**, Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
- LOWNDES, G., 1969, **The Silent Social Revolution**, London: Oxford University Press.
- MCBRIDE, THERESA M., 1976, **The Domestic Revolution: The Modernisation of Household Service in England and France 1820-1920**, London: Croom Helm.
- MCCLEARLY, G.F., 1933, **The Early History of the Infant Welfare Movement**, London: H.K. Lewis.
- MCFARLAN, DONALD M., 1982, **First for Boys: The Story of the Boys' Brigade 1883-1983**, Glasgow: Collins.
- MACFARLANE, ALAN, 1978, **The origins of English individualism: the family, property and social transition**, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- MACKENZIE, DONALD A., 1981, **Statistics in Britain 1865-1930. The Social Construction of Scientific Knowledge**, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- MACKENZIE, G., 1969, "The 'affluent worker' study: an evaluation and critique" in F. Parkin (ed.) **The Social Analysis of Class Structure**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MACLAREN, A.ALLAN, (ed.), 1976, **Social Class in Scotland: Past and Present**, Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers.
- MCLENNAN, GREGOR, 1981, "'The labour aristocracy' and 'incorporation': notes on some terms in the social history of the working class" **Social History** 6 (1), 71-81.
- MACPHERSON, C.B., 1972, **The Real World of Democracy**, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MACPHERSON, C.B., 1962, **The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke**, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MARWICK, ARTHUR, 1973, **The Deluge: British Society and the First World War**, London: Macmillan.
- MAY, MARGARET, 1973-74, "Innocence and Experience: The Evolution of the Concept of Juvenile Delinquency in the Mid-Nineteenth Century" **Victorian Studies** 17, 7-29.

- MELLING, JOSEPH (ed.), 1980, **Housing, social policy and the state**, London: Croom Helm.
- MILLS, C.WRIGHT, 1967, **The Sociological Imagination**, London: Oxford University Press.
- MODELL, JOHN, FURSTENBERG, FRANK and HERSHBERG, THEODORE, 1976, "Social Change and Transition to Adulthood in Historical Perspective" **Journal of Family History** 1(1), 7-32.
- MOORHOUSE, H.F., 1981, "The significance of the labour aristocracy" **Social History** 6 (2), 229-233.
- MORGAN, DAVID H.J., 1975, **Social Theory and the Family**, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- MORGAN, DAVID H. J. "Berger and Kellner's Construction of Marriage" Occasional Paper No. 7, Manchester: Department of Sociology, University of Manchester.
- MOWAT, CHARLES LOCH, 1968, **Britain Between the Wars**, London: Methuen.
- NEALE, R.S. (ed.), 1983, **History and Class: Essential Readings in Theory and Interpretation**, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- NEALE, R.S. 1981, **Class in English History 1680-1850**, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- NEWMAN, R.P., 1975, "Masturbation Madness and the Modal Concepts of Childhood and Adolescence" **Journal of Social History** 8 (1), 1-27.
- OAKLEY, ANN, 1974, **The Sociology of Housework**, London: Martin Robertson.
- PARSONS, TALCOTT and BALES, R.F., 1956, **Family Socialization and the Interaction Process**, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- PARSONS, TALCOTT, 1959, "The School Class as a Social System: Some of Its Functions in American Society" **Harvard Education Review** 29.
- PARSONS, TALCOTT, 1959, "The social structure of the family" in Anshen, R.N. (ed.) **The Family: its function and destiny**, New York: Harper.
- PARSONS, TALCOTT, 1962, "Youth in the Context of American Society" **Daedalus**, 91. Reprinted in Parsons 1970, 155-182.

- PARSONS, TALCOTT, 1964, "The Kinship System of the Contemporary United States" in Parsons, T. **Essays in Sociological Theory**, New York: Collier-Macmillan, Free Press (originally 1943 **American Anthropologist** 45, 22-38).
- PARSONS, TALCOTT, 1964, **Essays in Sociological Theory**, New York: Collier Macmillan, Free Press.
- PARSONS, TALCOTT, 1966, **Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives**, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- PARSONS, TALCOTT, 1970, **The Social System**, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul (first published 1951).
- PARSONS, TALCOTT, 1970, "The Link between Character and Society" **Social Structure and Personality**, New York: Collier Macmillan, Free Press.
- PARSONS, TALCOTT, 1970, **Social Structure and Personality**, New York: Collier Macmillan, Free Press.
- PARSONS, TALCOTT, 1974, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure" in Coser, R.L. (ed.) **The Family: Its Structures and Functions**, London: Macmillan (originally 1942 **American Sociological Review** 7, 604-616).
- PEACOCK, ROGER S., 1954, **Pioneer of Boyhood: The Story of W.A. Smith, Founder of Boys Brigade**, London: Boys Brigade.
- PERKIN, HAROLD, 1972, **The Origins of Modern English Society 1780-1880**, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- PHILLIPS, ANNE, 1980, "Sex and Class" **Revolutionary Socialism** 6, 19-22.
- PHILLIPS, ANNE and TAYLOR, BARBARA, 1980, "Sex and skill: notes towards a feminist economics" **Feminist Review** 6, 79-88.
- PINCHBEK, IVY, 1981, **Women Workers and the industrial revolution 1750-1850**, London: Virago Press (first published 1930).
- PINCHBECK, IVY and HEWITT, M., 1969, **Children in English Society Vol.2: From 18th Century to the Children Act 1848**, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- PLATT, JENNIFER, 1976, **Realities of Social Research: an empirical study of British sociologists**, London.
- POPPER, KARL, 1968, **The Logic of Scientific Discovery**, London: Hutchinson (revised edition).

- RICE, M. SPRING, 1981, **Working Class Wives**, London: Virago (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1939).
- ROBERTS, ELIZABETH, 1975, "Learning and Living - Socialisation outside School" **Oral History** 3(2) 14-28.
- ROBERTS, ELIZABETH, 1977, "Working class women in the North West" **Oral History** 5(2), 7-30.
- ROUTH, GUY, 1965, **Occupation and Pay in Great Britain 1906-1960**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- RUBINSTEIN, W.D., 1977, "Wealth, Elites and the Class Structure of Modern Britain" **Past and Present**, 76, 99-126.
- ROW NTREE, B.S., 1901, **Poverty: A Study of Town Life**, London: Macmillan.
- SAMUEL, RAPHAEL, 1977, "Workshop of the World: Steam Power and Hand Technology in Mid-Victorian Britain" **History Workshop** 3, 6-72.
- SAUL, S.B., 1969, **The Myth of the Great Depression**, London: Macmillan.
- SAYERS, R.S., 1973, **A History of Economic Change in England 1880-1939**, London: Oxford University Press.
- SCOTLAND, JAMES, 1969, **History of Scottish Education Vol.II**, London: University of London Press.
- SCOTT, JOHN W. and TILLY, LOUISE A., 1975, "Women's Work and the Family in 19th century Europe" **Comparative Studies in Society and History** 17, 36-64.
- SECOMBE, WALLY, 1974, "The housewife and her labour under capitalism" **New Left Review** 83, 3-24.
- SENNETT, RICHARD, 1970, **Families against the city: middle class homes of industrial Chicago 1872-1890**, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- SHERIDAN, ALAN, 1980, **Michel Foucault: The Will to Truth**, London: Tavistock Publications.
- SHORTER, E., 1977, **The Making of the Modern Family**, Fontana (first published 1975).
- SHOWALTER, ELAINE and ENGLISH, 1972, "Victorian Women and Menstruation" in Martha Vicinus (ed.), 38-44.
- SMELSER, NEIL J., 1959, **Social Change in the Industrial Revolution: An Application of Theory to the British Cotton Industry**, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- SMOUT, T.C., 1972, **A History of the Scottish People 1560-1830**, London: Fontana.
- SMOUT, T.C., 1981, "Scottish Marriage, Regular and Irregular, 1500-1940" in R.B. Outhwaite (ed.) **Marriage and Society: Studies in the Social History of Marriage**, London: Europa Publications Ltd.
- SNELL, K.D., 1981 "Agricultural Seasonal Unemployment, the Standard of Living and Women's Work in the South and East, 1690-1860" **Economic History Review**, Second Series, 34, 407-437.
- SOCIAL DEMOGRAPHIC RESEARCH GROUP 'Themes in Family Planning: Report No 2', Scottish Health Education Unit, 1979
- SOMMERVILLE, JOHN, 1982, **The Rise and Fall of Childhood**, London: Sage.
- SPRINGHALL, J.O., 1971, "The Boy Scouts, Class and Militarism in Relation to British Youth Movements 1908-1930" **International Review of Social History** 17, 125-158.
- SPRINGHALL, J.O., 1977, **Youth Empire and Society: British Youth Movements, 1883-1940**, London: Croom Helm.
- STEARNS, PETER, 1972, "Working Class Women in Britain 1890-1914" in Martha Vicinus (ed.), 100-120.
- STEVENSON, JOHN, 1977, **Social Conditions in Britain between the wars**, Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- STONE, LAWRENCE, 1979, **The Family, Sex and Marriage in England 1500-1800**, Harmondsworth: Penguin (first published Wiedenfeld and Nicholson 1977).
- STONE, LAWRENCE, 1965, **The Crisis of the Aristocracy, 1560-1660**, London: Oxford University Press.
- STONE, LAWRENCE, 1961, "Marriage among the English Nobility in the 16th and 17th Centuries" **Comparative Studies in Society and History** 3, 182-206.
- STRABCHEY, RAY, 1978, **The Cause: A short history of the Women's Movement in Great Britain**, London: Virago (first published 1928).
- SUMMERS, ANNE, 1979, "A Home from Home - Women's Philanthropic Work in the Nineteenth Century" in S. Burma (ed.), **Fit Work for Women**, London: Croom Helm, 33-63.
- SWAN, ANNIE, 1934 **My Life**, London: Ivor Nicolson and Watson.
- TAYLOR, PAM, "Daughters and Mothers - maids and mistresses: domestic service between the wars" in Clark, Critcher

and Johnson, 121-139.

- TAYLOR, SANDRA, 1977, "The effect of Marriage on Job Possibilities for women and the ideology of the home: Nottingham 1890-1930" **Oral History** 5(2), 46-61.
- THOMPSON, PAUL, 1975, "The War with Adults", **Oral History**, 3(2), 29-38.
- THOMPSON, PAUL, 1977, **The Edwardians: The Remaking of British Society**, London: Paladin.
- THOMPSON, PAUL, 1978, **The Voice of the Past: Oral History**, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- THOMPSON, THEA, 1981, **Edwardian Childhoods**, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- TILLY, LOUISE A., 1974, "Comments on Yans McLaughlin and Davidoff" **Journal of Social History** 7(4), 453-459.
- TILLY, LOUISE A and SCOTT, JOAN W., 1978, **Women, Work and Family**, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- TREBLE, JAMES H., 1978, "The seasonal demand for adult labour in Glasgow, 1890-1914" **Social History** 3 (1), 43-60.
- TRUMBACH, RANDOLPH, 1978, **The Rise of the Egalitarian Family: Aristocratic Kinship in Domestic Relations in Eighteenth Century England**, New York: Academic Press.
- VICINUS, MARTHA, "Introduction: The Perfect Victorian Lady" in Vicinus (ed.), vii-xv.
- VICINUS, MARTHA (ed.), 1972, **Suffer and Be Still: Women in the Victorian Age**, Indiana University Press.
- VIGNE, THEA, 1975, "Parents and Children 1890-1918: Distance and Dependence" **Oral History** 3(2), 6-13.
- VINCENT, DAVID, 1980, "Love and death and the nineteenth century working class" **Social History** 5 (2), 223-247.
- VINCENT, DAVID, 1981, **Bread, Knowledge and Freedom: A Study of Nineteenth Century Working Class Autobiography**, London: Europa Publications Ltd.
- WALVIN, JAMES, 1978, **Leisure and Society, 1830-1950**, London: Longman.
- WALVIN, JAMES, 1982, **A Child's World: A Social History of English Childhood 1800-1914**, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

- WHITELEGG, ELIZABETH, et al (eds.), 1982, **The Changing Experience of Women**, Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- WILKINSON, 1969, "English Youth Movement, 1908-1930" **Journal of Contemporary History** 4(2), 3-23.
- WITHRINGTON, DONALD J., 1975, "Attitudes to Truancy: Anxieties over Withdrawal from School, Historical Comment", **Research Intelligence** 1(2).
- WOHL, ANTHONY S. (ed.), 1978, **The Victorian Family: Structure and Stresses**, London: Croom Helm.
- WOODS, ROBERT, 1982, **Theoretical population geography** London: Longman
- WRIGLEY, EDWARD ANTHONY and SCHOFIELD, ROGER S., 1981, **The population history of England 1541-1871: a reconstruction**, London: Edward Arnold.
- YOUNG, MICHAEL and WILLMOTT, PETER, 1962, **Family and Kinship in East London**, Harmondsworth: Penguin (first published Routledge and Kegan Paul 1957).
- ZARETSKY, ELI, 1976, **Capitalism, the Family and Personal Life**, London: Pluto Press.